6-1-1969

The New Testament Concept of Shame

Richard Paul Bode

THE NEW TESTAMENT CONCEPT OF SHAME

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Exegetical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Sacred Theology

---

by

Richard Paul Bode

June 1969

[redacted]

Approved by: Victor Bartling
Advisor

Paul M. Bretscher
Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The present study is the result of a conflict of cultures. In 1959 the writer received a call from the Board for World Missions to serve as a missionary in the Philippines. The acceptance of that call demanded a double reorientation. Adjustments required by a transfer from a temperate to a tropical climate and the accompanying change in diet and clothing were relatively easy to make. More difficult and more subtle was the adjustment required by the transfer from one culture to another. Many of the presuppositions and values held by the writer since childhood were rejected or at least challenged. Not only were variant solutions proposed to the myriad problems of life, but even the manner of posing those questions differed.

Sociologists have isolated to a large extent the factors which determine attitudes and behavior in the Philippines. Their investigation of Philippine culture and life has insistently drawn attention to hiya as one of the most formative and influential forces. The term is usually translated "shame," but it has been suggested that "shyness," "timidity," "embarrassment" or "sensitivity" come closer to the real meaning of the word.[1] The recognition that a great difference exists between the Tagalog hiya[2] and "shame" as usually referred to in American English

---

[1]Jaime C. Bulatao, "Hiya," Philippine Studies, XII (July 1964), 424.

[2]The same concept is referred to kaulao, kaawud, huya, bain, dine, and baeng in other Filipino dialects, respectively Cebuano, Waray-waray, Hiligaynon, Ilocano, Kapangpangan, and Pangasinan. There are, in addition close similarities with the maratabat of the Maranao Muslims.

provided the impetus to examine the New Testament usage of the same concept.

Two basic and fundamental differences may be observed between what we have chosen to call the Eastern and Western[3] views of shame. The first relates to the importance of the concept, the second to its usage and function in society.

1. In the East shame is "a principle of unity within the culture,"[4] not only accepted by society but taught as a positive virtue designed to control behavior.[5] In the West, on the other hand, shame is an emotion which has little influence in determining the relationship of an individual to his society.

Since the appearance of Ruth Benedict's The Chrysanthemum and the Sword, entire societies have been characterized as manifesting "shame" or "guilt" cultures. "True shame cultures rely on external sanctions for good behavior, not, as true guilt cultures do, on an internalized conviction of sin."[6] Both shame and guilt are usually viewed as tensions developing within the individual but arising in part through the interplay with his cultural environment. Shame appears early in a child, it is said, as a result of an outer authority, namely social fear. Later, as

---

[3]The terminology may not be entirely felicitous. There seems to be, however, a concern for "face," social esteem and amor proprio (a term much used by Philippine sociologists) common to Eastern peoples which contrasts sharply with Western individualism.

[4]Bulatao, XII, 437.

[5]Bulatao, XII, 427, interestingly observes that in a Philippine workshop on hiya, U. S. Peace Corps Volunteers tended to look upon shame as a problem while the Filipinos present considered it the most natural thing in the world.

[6]Ruth Benedict, The Chrysanthemum and the Sword (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1946), p. 223.

the superego becomes more developed, the inner authority or consciousness of guilt emerges and supersedes shame.[7]

David Riesman describes the person living in a shame culture--what he calls a tradition-directed society--in the following words:

> The tradition-directed person feels the impact of his culture as a unit, but it is nevertheless mediated through the specific, small number of individuals with whom he is in daily contact. These expect of him not so much that he be a certain type of person but that he behave in the approved way. Consequently the sanction for behavior tends to be the fear of being "shamed."[8]

2. The second fundamental difference is that shame for the Easterner is primarily a social force, while in the West it is an emotion which might be described as personal in nature.

As Father Bulatao observes, "The Filipino's 'I am ashamed to you' is quite different from the American's 'I am ashamed of myself,' even though they may both use the same English term."[9] In the one case shame or the lack thereof is indicative of one's relation to and conformity with the society to which he belongs. In the other the presence of shame usually betokens a personal feeling of remorse or guilt over something an individual has done.

The Maranao Muslims of Mindanao represent to a heightened degree and in a relatively pure form the characteristics of a shame society.

---

[7]Milton L. Barnett, "Hiya, Shame and Guilt: Preliminary Considerations of the Concepts as Analytical Tools for Philippine Social Science," Philippine Sociological Review, XIV (October 1966), 278.

[8]David Riesman, The Lonely Crowd: A Study of the Changing American Character (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950), p. 25. Riesman presents a threefold cultural schema--tradition-directed, inner-directed, and other-directed. Shame, guilt, and anxiety serve respectively as the primary forces operative in each of these.

[9]Bulatao, XII, 427.

Maratabat--roughly equivalent to shame--has been described as the key to Maranao society. A study of maratabat concludes that it is

> not so much a psychological phenomenon as it is a sociological one. The "substance" of maratabat lies in the symbols, in the shared beliefs and images, in the collective representations, and in the public morality of the Maranaw.[10]

The same writers go on to describe maratabat as an integral part of society which exerts a coercion surpassing individual choice and individual psychology.[11]

Is the society which gave birth to the New Testament a guilt society or a shame society? Is the function of shame in the New Testament psychological or sociological? To what degree does the sanction of shame determine the behavior and life of the followers of Christ? These are some of the initial questions which aroused interest in carrying out the present study. The function of shame in the early Christian community and its usage in the New Testament does not conform precisely to either the Eastern or the Western view of shame; nor does it merely occupy a mediating middle ground between the two. Rather, the New Testament usage of the shame concept has definite and definable characteristics of its own. The purpose of this study is to isolate and give expression thereto.

To that end the chapter immediately following examines the etymology, meaning, and usage of five Greek roots which are essential to the New Testament concept of shame. Chapter III, entitled "Shame in Relation to the Uniqueness of the New Testament," examines a number of passages where

---

[10]Mamitua Saber and Mauyag M. Tamano with Charles K. Warriner, "The Maratabat of the Maranaw," Philippine Sociological Review, VIII (January-April 1960), 14.

[11]Ibid., VIII, 14.

the concept of shame appears together with an emphasis upon the uniqueness of the New Testament revelation. The three chapters which follow deal respectively with the nature and function of shame in the Christian community, its role in Christian ethics, and its importance for Christian eschatology. The final chapter is an attempt not only to answer the questions which prompted the investigation, but also to summarize the basic ideas and underlying characteristics of shame as it occurs in the New Testament.

CHAPTER II

THE GREEK ROOTS WHICH CONVEY THE IDEA OF SHAME

The writers of the New Testament employ five Greek roots in referring to the concept of shame. They are distinct from one another etymologically, occur with varying frequency, and are of unequal importance for our study. Yet each of them makes an invaluable contribution to the understanding of the New Testament concept of shame. The purpose of the present chapter is to examine them in turn, to see them in relationship to one another, and to remark the frequency with which they occur.

Aidōs

Bultmann provides a concise history of the word: "Aidōs was originally a basic concept in the Greek understanding of existence. It became rare in the time of Hellenism, but was brought back into use by the late Stoics."[1]

Two passages from the Iliad give content to the early usage of the word. When the Greek soldiers before Troy are tempted to lag behind and not take an active part in battle, their leaders urge them on by telling them to "feel shame before one another" (V, 530). Again, when Andromache makes an impassioned plea for her husband to remain within the walls of Troy rather than return to the heat of the battle, Hector replies:

---

[1]Rudolf Bultmann, "Aidōs," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel and translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), I, 169. Hereafter this work will be referred to as TDNT.

> I feel terrible shame before the Trojans and the women of Troy, at the thought that I should shrink from the war like a coward; nor does my spirit so bid me, for I was taught always to be a worthy man and to fight among the foremost of the Trojans" (VI, 441-6).

Aidōs then is a "sensitive shrinking from what is either unworthy of oneself or dishonouring to God."[2] As Homer uses the word it is one of the ideal marks of the nobleman, a virtue which motivates one to shun evil and to perform the acceptable. It is the ideal attitude toward everything divine and the proper respect shown in every situation in which an individual finds himself.

The comprehensive nature of aidōs becomes clear from the following statement:

> Aidōs comes on man because his existence stands in more than individual connections which surround and bind it with divine authority. It is regard for these connections, the bashful fear of breaking them. It is his attitude in face of the deinon, the awful, wherever and however manifested. . . . It is thus "reverence" before God, the priest, or an oath . . . . It is reverence for the king, for singers and orators, for parents and elders, for xenoi and hiketai. . . . It is respect for the law of hospitality and for the sanctity of the home and marriage. Above all, it expresses respect for the dikē which binds society together, for the polis and its nomos.[3]

In time Aidōs came to be personified as a goddess, and was honored cultically.[4] Needless to say, all Greeks did not conform to the severe standards of Aidōs, and Hesiod complained that in his day "Aidos and Nemesis have veiled their faces, and quitted the earth to rejoin the other gods on Olympus, leaving nothing to mankind but suffering and

---

[2]Dictionary of the Apostolic Church, edited by James Hasting (New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1918), II, 473.

[3]Bultmann, I, 169.

[4]Ibid., I, 170.

endless strife."[5] The luster of Aidōs was further tarnished by the teachings of the sophists who, in adopting a more pragmatic view of life, discarded the heroic virtues of the Homeric period.

Plato, Isocrates, and Democritus attempted to repair the wrong and to restore Aidōs to her proper place.[6] Plato (c. 427-348) attributed the breakdown of the rule of law and the collapse of morality to the loss of Aidōs on the part of the citizens.[7] Isocrates (436-338)

> went back to the old aristocratic morality, not only for separate rules and for the principle of imitating great models, but also for the sense of honourable shame, aidos, as the basis of ethical conduct.[8]

Democritus (born c. 460) attempted to revive the rule of Aidōs, but altered its meaning slightly. Jaeger says that he

> attributed a new importance to the old Greek concept of aidos, secret shame, and replaced the aidos which men feel for the law--the feeling which had been annihilated by sophistic critics like Antiphon, Critias, and Callicles--with the wonderful idea of aidos which a man feels for himself.[9]

---

[5]Werner Jaeger, Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture (New York: Oxford University Press, 1939), I, 57.

[6]Aristotle, on the other hand, regards shame not as a virtue (aretē), but as an emotion (pathos), which he defines as a fear of disrepute (phobos adoxias). The feeling of aidōs, he says, is not suitable to every age, but only to the young. The virtuous man should never feel shame since he should not commit base actions. In the sections where Aristotle speaks of shame (Nicomachean Ethics II, 7, 14 and IV, 9, 1-8) it should be noted, however, that Aristotle uses aidōs and aischynē almost interchangeably, making little distinction between them.

[7]In Republic 560 d, it appears that for Plato Aidōs is thought of as the secret advisor of the part of the soul which has been ruling hitherto; because of her good influence on the soul Aidōs is particularly hated by the unruly lusts which head the revolution against law and order.

[8]Jaeger, III, 122.

[9]Ibid., I, 328.

This creation of a new concept was highly important in the development of the ethical consciousness, extending the older social emphasis of shame to include a shame which man feels for himself.[10] Increasingly the term came to describe the attitude of the individual toward himself, his disposition of soul. In this sense it was taken over and revived by the later Stoics.

Turning to the New Testament we find that aidōs and its cognates are seldom used,[11] being usually replaced by the other words considered in this chapter. The noun aidos occurs with certainty[12] only once, being mentioned together with sophrosynē at 1 Tim. 2:9.[13] The verb is absent as is the adjective. The alpha-privative form anaideia, occuring at Luke 11:8, denotes an absence of shame and signifies action or behavior contrary to the norms established by God and society.[14] Closely connected in meaning with hybris, it depicts the shamelessness of the robber of temples, the lack of shame of the avaricious, and the impudence of the person who knows no restraint.[15]

---

[10]Ibid., II, 378-79.

[11]The root occurs somewhat more frequently in the Septuagint, conforming generally to the classical Greek usage. The noun occurs twice, the verb seven times, the adjective aidēmōn--describing the modest behavior of good persons--twice. The genitals are referred to as ta aidoia at Ezek. 23:20.

[12]The occurrence of aidos in the inferior reading of Heb. 12:28 is rejected on textual grounds.

[13]Infra, p. 85.

[14]The affinity between anaideia and what Philippine sociologists call walang hiya is remarkably close. In his article "Hiya," Philippine Studies, XII, 3 (July 1964), 429-30, Father Jaime Bulatao defines the latter phrase as a "term of opprobrium" applied to another when "the person violates social expectation. . . . Walang hiya then means a recklessness regarding the social expectations of society, an inconsideration for the feelings of others, an absence of sensitivity to the censures of authority or society."

[15]Bultmann, I, 170. Compare also Hermann Cremer, Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1954), p. 612.

Finally, the numinous quality which surrounds the use of the word aidōs should be mentioned. This is evident especially in the earlier Greek period and in the fact that the virtue of shame was deified. Even when it becomes primarily an ethical and moral concept, however, it retains an aura of dignity, holiness, and sanctity.

Aischynē

The Stoics differentiated between aidōs and aischynē by saying that the former is a fear in connection with an expectation of censure (phobos epi prosdokia psogou) while the latter is a fear resulting from a shameful deed (phobos ep' aischrō pepragmenō).[16] While this distinction possesses a certain validity, it has nonetheless been criticized. Archbishop Trench has pointed out that aischynē is not always retrospective, looking back to something unworthily done. Rather it frequently expresses that "feeling which leads to shun what is unworthy out of a prospective anticipation of dishonour."[17] And Rudolf Bultmann observes that aischynē need not be related to a deed at all, but may result from a status or circumstance in life, as a lowly origin or a humiliating destiny.[18]

---

[16]Bultmann, I, 170. This distinction was repeated by John of Damascus in his De Fide Orthodoxa, 2, 15.

[17]Richard C. Trench, Synonyms of the New Testament (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Truebner and Co. Ltd., 1915), pp. 63-64. The unrighteous steward of Luke 16:1-8, for example, had not yet begun to beg. In referring to this passage, George Benedict Winer, A Grammar of the New Testament Diction (Philadelphia: Smith, English and Co., 1859), I, 363, points out that had the person already begun to beg, Luke would have used the participle of epaiteō rather than the infinitive.

[18]Rudolf Bultmann, "Aischynē," TDNT, I, 189.

In spite of the fact that the two words were soon linked together and the verbs especially came to be used interchangeably, "almost every passage in which either occurs attests the sense of a real difference existing between them."[19] Wherein precisely does this difference lie?

First of all, it should be noted that aidōs is the higher and more noble word; it always remained a lofty ideal to be pursued by the virtuous man. Aischynē, by comparison, is a practical everyday type of word which describes an emotion common to all people; it "remained in common use even in the lower strata of Greek,"[20] and the examples provided by Moulton and Milligan testify to its frequent application to the not-so-virtuous.[21]

Furthermore, the presence of aidōs always implies a praiseworthy motive; in it is involved "an innate moral repugnance to the doing of the dishonorable act."[22] Aischynē, on the other hand, is concerned not about morals but about reputation. Deliberating as to whether he should perform a certain act, the person motivated by aischynē does not inquire concerning its innate virtue, but rather asks, "What will people say or think? Will my act meet with censure or approbation?" Having done something, the presence or absence of aischynē is determined not by the moral excellence thereof, but by the standards of the group to which the person belongs, irrespective of the validity or godliness of those standards. The cause of shame then is not the

---

[19]Trench, p. 63.

[20]Bultmann, "Aischynē," I, 189.

[21]James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated From the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1949), pp. 14-15.

[22]Trench, p. 64.

> consciousness of a right which has been, or would be, violated by his act, but only in his apprehension of other persons who are, or who might be, privy to its violation. Let this apprehension be removed, and the aischynē ceases.[23]

According to Bultmann aidōs was originally a religious term while aischynē is sociological. The two were subsequently equated because the deinon to which the former refers is to be found primarily in society, and because the Sophists reduced religious terms to the level of sociology by interpreting religious bonds as social.[24] Nonetheless a difference may be observed regarding the sphere of life in which each term originally functioned, a difference accentuated by the fact that aischynē never achieves the cultic status which is accorded the more noble term.

Finally, the relative importance of the two terms for biblical thought is worthy of comment. While the "most notable point" of the early Christian usage of aidōs is that it "does not really play any part,"[25] the presence or absence of aischynē is remarked forty-five times in the New Testament. The meaning and importance of the root must now be examined more closely.

The original meaning of the very aischynē is "to disfigure" or "to make repugnant." Since the injury inflicted is frequently emotional or social rather than physical it acquires the meaning of "to disgrace" or "to dishonor" or "to shame." The root is frequently compounded with the prepositions epi and kata, and appears most frequently in the middle-passive.

---

[23] Ibid., pp. 64-65.

[24] Bultmann, Aidōs, I, 170.

[25] Ibid., I, 171.

The uncompounded form of the verb occurs only five times. The addition of the prefix epi in eleven instances serves to focus attention upon the emotion felt by the person involved, while the fourteen[26] cases where kata is prefixed direct us rather to the action which causes shame.[27]

The noun aischynē is used both in a subjective sense and also with an objective meaning. The former signifies the fear or emotion aroused by that which is repugnant in word, deed, or appearance; the latter use denotes that object or deed which brings shame upon a person.[28] The New Testament writers employ the noun six times, and the corresponding adjective aischros four times.[29]

The five remaining New Testament usages of the root reveal the variety and richness of the word. Three times (1 Tim. 3:8, Titus 1:7, 1 Peter 5:2) it is used in combination with kerdēs, signifying a fondness for dishonest gain; the combination with ---logia (Col. 3:8) denotes obscene or abusive speech, as does the use of the noun aischrotēs at Eph. 5:4; finally it occurs with the alpha-privative anepaischyntos at 2 Tim. 2:15.

---

[26]Including the questionable variant reading at Matt. 20:28.

[27]By comparison Hatch and Redpath lists eighty-nine occurrences of the uncompounded verb, seventy-three instances where kata is prefixed, and only three cases where epi is compounded with the simple verb. An examination of the passages involved in comparison with New Testament usage compels the conclusion that while the LXX translators made little or no distinction between the simple and compounded verbs, the New Testament writers in general observe closely the nuances involved in the use of the prepositional prefixes. Bultmann's judgment, Aischynē, I, 189, that the verbs are used interchangeably in the New Testament cannot be accepted.

[28]A comparison of Luke 14:9 and Rev. 3:18 brings out the difference very clearly.

[29]The noun occurs seventy-six times in the Septuagint; six of the ten occurrences of the adjective aischros are in reference to the "gaunt" cows in Pharaoh's dream (Genesis 41). In addition the adjective aischyntēros, modest, appears thrice while the adverb aischrōs is used twice.

Entropē

Etymologically the verb entrepō meant "to turn about," "to turn toward," or "to turn in." From this basic meaning it acquires the two-fold signification which it has in biblical literature: (1) The idea of shame derives from the thought of causing someone to turn, or of a person's turning in upon himself, thus producing shame; (2) The idea of reverence or respect derives from the act of turning toward someone in order to pay the respect and give the regard due him because of position or influence. The noun entropē therefore carries with it the double idea of "shame, humiliation" and "respect, regard."

While the two meanings at first glance appear quite dissimilar, they are in fact closely related. Although it somehow does not possess the dignity of aidōs, the word does reproduce almost precisely the main emphases thereof. Blass and Debrunner correctly mentions entrepō as an etymologically dissimilar word which replaced aidōs during the period of Hellenism.[30] It will be remembered that aidōs, although revived by the later Stoics, was rarely used in the Hellenistic period.

The distinctive feature of the New Testament usage of the word is pointed out by Trench:

> Entropē has something in it which neither aidōs nor aischynē has. . . . It conveys at least a hint of that change of conduct, that return of a man upon himself, which a wholesome shame brings with it in him who is its subject.[31]

---

[30]F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament And Other Early Christian Literature (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), pp. 68-69.

[31]Trench, p. 65.

A quick glance at the nine occurrences of the verb and the two of the noun in the New Testament shows that it always retains the positive force remarked by Trench.

The meaning of "to respect, to reverence" is found in Mark 12:6 and parallels where it refers to the respect which ought to have been, but was not, shown by the tenants to the son of the landlord. Luke twice mentions that the unjust judge of Luke 18:1-5 did not respect his fellow men, anthrōpon mē entrepomenos.[32] The same basic idea is found at Heb. 12:9, where the author remarks that we have respected our earthly fathers. The idea of "shame, humiliation" is present in the five occurrences in the Pauline corpus. In one case what Paul has written to the Corinthians (4:14) is not intended to cause shame while in the two cases where the noun occurs the abuse is so flagrant that he does anticipate and expect shame on the part of his addressees.[33] Finally,

> The Pastoral Letters teach that the disobedient Christian is to be avoided, that he may be ashamed (2 Th. 3:14), and that the servant of Christ is to behave irreproachably, that his opponent may be ashamed (entrapē, Tit. 2:8).[34]

---

[32]The same disregard for custom and the position of others may be observed in the person who is branded as being anaidēs.

[33]Moulton and Milligan, p. 219, "are unable to illustrate the meaning of 'shame' which this word has" at 1 Cor. 6:5 and 15:34. But they do cite examples of the noun "for the derived sense of 'respect,' 'reverence.'"

[34]Dictionary of the Apostolic Church, II, 473. Septuagint usage does not reveal the consistent positive emphasis which the New Testament exhibits. Six of the seven occurrences of the noun are found in the Psalms, always in conjunction with aischynē and/or eneidismos. The verb entrepō appears forty-three times, scattered throughout the Septuagint.

Atimia

In order to appreciate fully the basic idea of atimia one must examine the meaning and force of the root from which it is formed. The TIM- root recurs frequently in the New Testament, both in its simple and in its alpha-privative form. The noun hē timē signifies first of all "the price" or "the value" of something, but more frequently exhibits the derived meaning of "honor, respect." The verb timaō denotes the act of "setting a price" or "estimating," but ordinarily means "to honor."[35]

Ultimately all honor belongs to and derives from God. For this reason the New Testament doxologies frequently ascribe timē to God (1 Tim. 1:17, 6:16, Rev. 4:9-11, 5:13, 7:12). And because Christ is the representative and revealer par excellence of God, honor is also ascribed to Him (John 5:23, 12:26; Heb. 2:7, 3:3; 2 Peter 1:17; Rev. 5:12-13). The honor which belongs to God and derives from God, furthermore, extends to all His representatives upon earth. This is true of the religious sphere: of prophets (Matt. 13:57; Mark 6:4; John 4:44), of religious teachers in general (Acts 5:34; 1 Tim. 5:17), and of those to whom we are bound by religious ties (Rom. 12:10; 1 Tim. 5:3). It is also true in the secular sphere: of government (Rom. 13:7; compare Mark 12:17), and its representatives (1 Peter 2:17).

Beyond this, however, all the relationships of life are invested with a certain honor: that of husband and wife (1 Thess. 4:4; Heb. 13:4; 1 Peter 3:7), that of parents and children (Matt. 15:4,6, 19:19; Mark 7:10,

---

[35] William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), pp. 824-5.

10:19; Luke 18:20; Eph. 6:2), that of master and slave (1 Tim. 6:1). And by virtue of God's creation, His honor expands to include the human body (1 Cor. 12:23-26), artifacts produced by the ingenuity of man (Rom. 9:21; 2 Tim. 2:20-21), and the fruits of the earth (James 5:7). Above all relationships in which man finds himself, both divine and human, the dictum of Paul, Rom. 13:7, stands, "Discharge your obligations to all; pay tax and toll, reverence and respect, to those to whom they are due."

The atimia complex of verbs (atimazō, atimaō, atimoō) is used seven times in the New Testament, and denotes simply a lack or absence of timē, which may come about in either of two closely-related ways: (1) When a person refuses to acknowledge or recognize the honor or position possessed by another. An example would be Christ's quotation of Is. 29:13 against the Scribes and Pharisees.[36] Although they render lip-service to God, they ignore the deeper demands of His Law, and refuse to offer the heart-worship which God requires. One person thus dishonors another when he does not respond in an appropriate manner to the claims made by the dignity or position of another. (2) When one party actively attempts, by word or deed, to deprive another of his honor. Three Old Testament examples provide adequate illustration. Sarah was dishonored by the attitude and action of Hagar after her slave had conceived (Gen. 16:4-5); the messengers sent by King David to Hanun were dishonored when their beards were shaved and their garments cut off at their hips (1 Chron. 19:4-5); Queen Vashti, by her refusal to appear at the behest of her

---

[36]Matt. 15:8; Mark 7:6.

husband, not only dishonored[37] the King, but also set an unworthy example for the other ladies of the realm (Esther 1:16-18).

The noun atimia is found seven times in the New Testament, signifying "dishonor, disgrace, shame," and usually in contrast to either timē or doxa. It is thus frequently involved in denoting the comparative glory or dishonor of various objects, acts, or persons. The noun is never used of the subjective feeling of shame which a person experiences.

The meaning of the adjective atimos corresponds to the twofold emphasis detected in the use of the verb: it thus means either "unhonored" or "dishonored." The adjectival use occurs four times.[38]

All honor, we have said, ultimately derives from and belongs to God. This does not mean that the terms timē and atimia are used primarily in a religious sense, nor that they usually occur in reference to the religious sphere. On the contrary, the determining of what is "honorable" and what is "disgraceful" is a function assumed by society. Where that society is primarily a religious grouping, the conventions and mores involved may be tied very closely to its concept of God, but the restrictions imposed and the standards set are primarily social.[39]

---

[37]Although ētimasen is only the inferior reading at Esther 1:16, the use of the same verb coupled with the adverb homoiōs at 1:18 definitely refers the act of dishonoring her husband to Vashti.

[38]LXX usage generally conforms to that of the New Testament. The verb occurs forty-nine times; the noun forty-eight times, with atimasmos as a variant reading at 1 Macc. 1:40; the adjective thirteen times including the two instances where the variant atimētas is used.

[39]In his article "Shame" in Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, edited by James Hastings (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1958), XI, 446-47, E. S. Ames observes that "the divergencies among races in reference to the situation in which they experience this emotion are astonishing and give weight to the impression that education and environment are the chief factors."

Oneidos

"Etymologically oneidos belongs not to onomai, but to an indo-germanic root neid--'to revile, to run down.'"[40] The root never signifies the subjective feeling of shame which an individual feels, but rather indicates an object, act, or situation which brings shame upon someone. Two incidents recorded in the Old Testament will help to isolate some of the characteristics of the word.

1 Samuel 17 records the battle between David and Goliath. The action of Goliath and particularly the challenge, verses 8 to 10, which he hurled to the Israelites cause dismay and fear to Saul and his army. The action of the Philistine is specifically referred to by the verb oneidizō (17:9,25,26,36,45), and as a result thereof an oneidos or oneidismos attaches to Israel.[41] The honor of the nation can be vindicated only by the removal of this cause of shame (17:26,36). By defeating and killing Goliath, David does in fact remove the disgrace, as also testified to in Sirach 47:7 and Ps. 151:7.

The second incident, somewhat later in Israel's history, is recorded in 4 Kings 18-19, 2 Chronicles 32, and Isaiah 36-37. Through the words of his emissary impudently proclaimed in a public place, and also by means of a letter written to King Hezekiah, Sennacherib reviles and heaps insults upon the kingdom of Judah and her God. The removal of the

---

[40]Johannes Schneider, "Oneidos," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1954), V, 238.

[41]Ibid., V, 238, gives as one of the meanings of oneidos "der mit Schande bedeckt ist u anderen Schande bringt."

oneidismos is predicted by the prophet Isaiah to King Hezekiah and is accomplished by the angel of the Lord.

The characteristics to be noted from these incidents are three in number:

1. The oneidos which brings and causes shame is frequently imposed by an outside force or person. It furthermore indicates contempt (as in the incidents considered) or strong disapproval (as for example in Matt. 11:20) on the part of the other person. Even when the oneidos referred to is a state of being,[42] it nonetheless reflects standards imposed by society.

2. The oneidos which causes shame is frequently related to speaking. In some cases, as in the examples cited and in Joel 2:17, the actual words are quoted. New Testament examples would be Matt. 27:44 and Mark 15:32, where we are told that the thieves crucified with Christ reviled him (ōneidizon auton); in the parallel Luke significantly has eblasphēmei. Another would be the post-resurrection appearance of Jesus to His disciples, when He "upbraided (ōneidisen) them for their unbelief and hardness of heart," Mark 16:14. Schneider observes that oneidos is frequently combined with such verbs as legein, epipherein, bazein, and the like; also that the word itself comes to mean "Schimpfwort, Schmähredе."[43]

3. An element characteristic of all five words treated in this study, but which comes out especially strong in oneidos, is the public nature of shame. This becomes clear in the Septuagint from the use of such phrases

---

[42]As for example sterility (Gen. 30:23; Luke 1:25), widowhood (Is. 4:1, 54:4), uncircumcision (Joshua 5:8-9), and a miserable existence (Job 19:5, 7).

[43]Schneider, V, 238.

as "before all the nations," and "in the presence of the whole world" which frequently occur in connection with oneidos.[44] The outstanding New Testament example is Heb. 10:33 where, in referring to former persecutions endured, the author says that his addressees were "sometimes being publicly exposed to abuse and affliction," oneidismois te kai thlipsesin theatrizomenoi.[45]

Including the variant readings at Mark 15:34 and 1 Tim. 4:10 the verb oneidizō is used eleven times in the New Testament. In meaning it closely approximates atimazō and kataischynō, representing an action which is intended to bring shame on someone. In the New Testament Christ can be the one who performs this action, reproaching the cities which rejected Him (Matt. 11:20) and the disciples for their unworthy behavior (Mark 16:14). More often however He Himself (Matt. 27:44; Mark 15:32; Rom. 15:3) or His followers (Matt. 5:11; Luke 6:22; 1 Peter 4:14) are the ones reviled.

The nouns oneidos and oneidismos demonstrate no significant difference in meaning.[46] The former occurs but once in the New Testament while the latter is used five times.[47] An oneidos or oneidismos results when someone, whether an individual or a nation, violates or offends against morals or

---

[44]Compare for example Judith 5:21 and Dan. 9:16.

[45]The English translation scarcely does justice to the Greek verb, which indicates being a "spectacle" in a public theatre. Compare 1 Cor. 4:9.

[46]Both Arndt and Gingrich, p. 573 and Schneider, V, 239, state that oneidismos is a late word, but make no essential distinction in meaning between the two. The latter says that "Die Grenzen von oneidos u oneidismos sind in LXX zT fliessend."

[47]Corresponding figures for the LXX are fifty-seven and eighty-two respectively for oneidos and oneidismos, although the total number would be lessened considerably due to an overlapping of the two nouns. The verb occurs fifty-six times.

customs divinely or humanly ordained.[48] The existence of such an oneidos affects relationships between the parties involved, which change continues until or unless the cause thereof has been removed.

In meaning the noun is very close to the objective meaning of aischynē noted above. A peculiarity of oneidos is the manner in which it is treated as almost possessing objective existence.[49] As a consequence an oneidos can be given, taken, carried, removed, attached to something or somebody, and others.[50]

Summary

At this point one may conveniently pause for a few observations by way of summary.

The five roots examined in this chapter occur a total of ninety-four times in the writings of the New Testament.[51] These are divided as follows, with the number of Septuagint occurrences listed for purposes of comparison.

---

[48]Schneider, V, 239.

[49]The same thing is true, although not to the same extent, of aischynē.

[50]Biblical examples are too numerous to mention. A classical example is found in Sophocles' Oedipus Tyrannus, line 1494. After the suicide of his wife-mother and the blinding of himself, the two daughters of Oedipus are brought before him. He laments the effect which the tragedy will have upon them. When they are of marriageable age, he says, there will be no one who will wed them, for in so doing the husband would take unto himself an oneidos which would cling even to the grandchildren.

[51]The tabulations include variant readings, but exclude cases where variants of the same root overlap in a particular instance. Where words denoting shame occur more than once in the same verse (as e.g. Mark 8:38) each occurrence is counted separately.

	LXX	N.T.	Total
Aidōs	28	3	31
Aischynē	255	45	300
Entropē	50	11	61
Atimia	109	18	127
Oneidos	188	17	205
Totals	630	94	724

The concept of shame is obviously part of the basic substructure of biblical life and thought. This does not necessarily mean that it is at the center of biblical theology nor that it is of decisive theological significance. It does indicate, however, that the writers of biblical literature found the concept ready at hand and frequently used it to describe an emotion commonly experienced by people who lived in biblical times.

The variety and richness of the concept is also deserving of mention. Much of this is attributable to the five roots employed and their relation to one another. The words are not synonymous; they are etymologically distinct, and their usage and frequency differs greatly. There is nonetheless an integral relation between them, each looking at and describing the same human emotion from various points of view. The multiplicity of forms assumed by the roots--mentioned above especially in connection with aischynē--and the variety of situations in which the concept appears also contribute to its richness.

Two peculiarities of the use of the shame-concept should be noted:

1. The absence of shame is remarked just as frequently, if not more so, than the presence thereof. This is accomplished in the case of aidōs,

and once with aischynē, by employing the alpha-privative. More frequently, however, and especially in connection with aischynē and entropē the absence of shame is announced by using the simple negative.

2. The verb of all five roots frequently occurs in the middle-passive form. This gives rise to a problem enunciated by C. F. D. Moule: "There is the problem, where the form of Middle and Passive is the same, of determining whether the verb is to be given a passive sense, or an active sense (like a Latin deponent), or a middle sense."[52] The difficulty of selecting a middle or passive meaning for a verb is however, I believe, largely removed by the very nature of shame as it reveals itself in the Bible and in life. Explicitly or implicitly, three factors are always presupposed. One is the person who experiences or feels the emotion of shame; the second is the object or person which causes shame; the third is the person or object in whose presence shame is felt.[53] This means that a passive element is always operative even when one is compelled to translate the verb as a middle voice.

This basic orientation of the concept of shame involving three factors, should be kept in mind as one reads the chapters that follow.

---

[52]C. F. D. Moule, An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek (Cambridge: University Press, 1960), p. 25.

[53]Here expression is given to a basic ingredient of the concept of shame. A person never feels shame in isolation, but only in confrontation with someone or something. This may on occasion be confrontation with one's own inner self or with the standards and principles one accepts, but it cannot be emphasized too strongly that the element of confrontation is inevitably present. As stated by Ruth Benedict, The Chrysanthemum and the Sword (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1946), p. 223, shame "requires an audience or at least a man's fantasy of an audience."

CHAPTER III

SHAME IN RELATION TO THE UNIQUENESS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

Continuity and Diversity

Both the continuity and the diversity of the biblical revelation must be affirmed. H. H. Rowley has rightly pointed out that these two elements are not as contradictory as they appear. Rather, he maintains that "the most significant bond of unity between the two Testaments [is to be found] . . . in the fundamental differences between the two Testaments."[1] As we turn our investigation to the use of the shame-concept in the New Testament, these two elements must be kept in mind. The tendency to equate continuity and identity must be resisted, as well as the inclination to consider the new without reference to the old.

The covenant established between Jahwe and the Jewish nation at Mount Sinai was both conditional and temporary. At the proper time it was to be superseded by a new covenant which was both unconditional and final, an ultimate revelation of the will of God in history by which He orders the relation between Himself and man according to His saving purpose.[2]

The new covenant is established by the appearance of the Kingdom in the person of Jesus Christ. It is the conviction of the New Testament authors that

---

[1]H. H. Rowley, The Unity of the Bible (New York: World Publishing Company, 1961), p. 86.

[2]Johannes Behm, "Diathēkē," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel and translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), II, 134. Hereafter this work will be referred to as TDNT.

> The new covenant inaugurated by Jesus is qualitatively different from the way in which God ordered His relation to man in the past, a supreme and final arrangement between God and His community, never to be supplanted or surpassed.[3]

The idea of shame repeatedly occurs in contexts where the uniqueness of the New Testament faith is clearly evident. In this chapter we propose to examine the pertinent passages. It will be observed that in every case there is a looking-back to the revelation of the old covenant, but at the same time a reinterpretation of the events, quotations, and relationships which provide a uniquely Christian emphasis.

James 1:5 and Heb. 11:13-16 shed light on the Christian conception of God; Heb. 2:5-18 and 12:2 point out the significance of the life and death of Jesus Christ; the passages where Is. 28:16 is quoted (Rom. 9:33, 10:11; and 1 Peter 2:6) illumine the meaning of Christian faith; and 1 Peter 2:4-10 and 4:14-16 testify to the existence of a new religious community.

The Christian Conception of God

James 1:5

James describes God as one who "gives to all men generously and without reproaching," tou didontos theou pasin haplōs kai mē oneidizontos.[4] No doubt the example of King Solomon, who asked for wisdom and received much more (1 Kings 3:5-14), is present in the author's mind. For us the

---

[3]Roy A. Harrisville, The Concept of Newness in the New Testament (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1960), p. 47.

[4]While the description is found in a context dealing with prayer, it is nonetheless clear that James is stating a general principle of God's gracious dealing with men.

important point is the manner in which God answers our requests. He does not cause the painful emotion of shame in those who ask.

Such shame may be provoked in various ways. For example, the person asked may cause shame in the petitioner by refusing his request. This is not the case with God, who is characterized as one "who gives,"[5] and the objects of His generosity are all men. The Christian God is one who "makes His sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the just and on the unjust (Matt. 5:45)." Exhorting his readers to demonstrate the same type of generosity, The Shepherd of Hermas says:

> Do good, and of all your toil which God gives you, give in simplicity to all who need, not doubting to whom you shall give and to whom not; give to all, for to all God wishes gifts to be made of his own bounties.[6]

Or shame may be caused in him who asks if the giver grants the request grudgingly or places conditions on the disposition of the gift. Concerning the manner in which God gives, Moffatt says that "He bestows on us what we need without asking embarrassing questions about our deserts and without a hard word, never harping on the benefit."[7] Luke 6:38 and John 3:34 give content to the adverb haplōs.[8] Mayor points out that the

---

[5]Cf. the comments of Joseph Mayor on James 1:17 in his commentary The Epistle of St. James (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1954).

[6]Mandate 2:4.

[7]Quoted by Alexander Ross, The Epistles of James and John (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1960), p. 29.

[8]"Give, and it will be given to you; good measure, pressed down, shaken together, running over, will be put into your lap" (Luke 6:38). "It is not by measure that he (God) gives the Spirit" (John 3:34).

adverb may be taken in either a logical sense "unconditionally" or in a moral sense "generously,"[9] but both ideas are present.[10]

Finally, the giver may cause shame in the recipient after the gift has been given either by pressing for repayment or by reminding the recipient of the generosity of which he has been the object. But the gifts of God are irrevocable, and the godly attitude is expressed in the advice of Sirach 41:22: "After you have given, do not upbraid, mē oneidize." The attitude of the Christian toward giving and lending as expounded by Jesus is meaningful by virtue of the fact that it is patterned after God's example:

> Give to everyone who asks you; when a man takes what is yours, do not demand it back . . . . If you lend only where you expect to be repaid, what credit is that to you? Even sinners lend to each other if they are to be repaid in full. But you must love your enemies and do good; and lend without expecting any return . . . You will be sons of the most High, because he himself is kind to the ungrateful and wicked" (Luke 6:30-35 NEB).

The generous and unconditional nature of God's dealing with men is exactly that aspect of His nature which characterizes the new covenant established with men through faith in Christ Jesus. And thus St. James can go on to say, "Every good endowment that we possess and every complete gift that we have received must come from above, from the Father of all lights, with whom there is never the slightest variation or shadow of inconsistency" (1:17 Phillips).

---

[9]Mayor, p. 39.

[10]Otto Bauernfeind, "Haplous, Haplotēs," TDNT, I, 386, stresses the idea of "wholeheartedness" and absence of ulterior motive which are contained in the word.

Hebrews 11:13-16

The same principles of God's dealing with men are also evident in this passage which is inserted between two sections dealing with the faith of Abraham. And while Abraham is the supreme Old Testament example of faith--as attested also by Paul and James--the words are intended as a summary of God's dealing with all those named in the chapter of the heroes of faith.[11] The climax of the section is found in 11:16, "God is not ashamed of them, not ashamed to be called their God,"[12] ouk epaischynetai autous ho theos theos epikaleisthai autōn, "for he has prepared for them a city."

Frequently in this world one of a higher status or standing is embarrassed to associate with those of lower caste or social position. Not so with God. In spite of the great distance separating God and man He does not blush to identify Himself with and to associate with His creatures. What is meant by this is illustrated by 11:2, "the men of old received divine approval," and 11:4, which states that Abel received approval as righteous. And of Enoch it is said, 11:5, that "he pleased God." The nature of Christian faith will be treated more fully in our discussion of Is. 28:16, but at this point we may observe that the manner in which God deals with man stresses both His majesty and His mercy.

---

[11]F. F. Bruce, The Epistle to the Hebrews (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964), p. 303.

[12]Brooke Foss Westcott, The Epistle to the Hebrews (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., n.d.), p. 364, renders it thus, stating that the second clause is added in explanation. J. Moffatt, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1957), p. 176, states that "to be called" is an epexegetic infinitive.

The distance between God and man is preserved in the name by which men call Him--Theos. The contrast between the two is indicated by two sets of corollaries: Creator and creature, finite and Infinite,[13] and the Bible never relaxes the great difference between them. Regardless of the gracious relationship established between them, God remains Theos and man remains anthropos.

The reverse side of God's nature, however--His mercy and love--is the one particularly stressed in this passage. God reveals His character in His activity,[14] and this is described in the passage under consideration as an absence of shame to relate to men in spite of the shameful condition of man. Moffatt remarks that He might have been ashamed to call Himself God had He not prepared a reward for man's faith.[15] When men honor God, God honors men.

> The patriarchs honored God by putting their faith in Him; He honored them by calling Himself 'the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob' (Exodus 3:6). What higher honor than this could be paid to any mortal.[16]

In honoring the man of faith God observes and recognizes the honor that He Himself has bestowed upon him. The dramatic nature of God's condescension is stressed by the men with whom He identifies. Bruce points out that "It is noteworthy that, while Jacob is in many ways the least

---

[13]Reinhold Niebuhr, The Nature and Destiny of Man (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949), I, 170 and passim, points out that the finiteness of man "is not regarded as of itself evil," but that this finiteness on the other hand "is never obscured" by Scripture.

[14]H. H. Rowley, The Faith of Israel (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956), p. 59.

[15]Moffatt, p. 176.

[16]Bruce, p. 306.

exemplary of the three, God is called the God of Jacob more frequently in the Bible than He is called the God of Abraham or of Isaac."[17]

The absence of shame on the part of God results in the preparation of a city for the faithful.[18] But the Old Testament heroes of faith did not receive what was promised since God had foreseen something better (11:39-40). The life and death of Jesus Christ, to which we now turn, is the ultimate interpretation of Heb. 11:16.

The Life and Death of Jesus

Hebrews 2:5-18

Certain similarities between Heb. 11:16 and 2:11 are worthy of notice. Precisely the same phrase, "He is not ashamed" (ouk epaischynetai), occurs in both; in the former it is predicated of God, in the latter of Jesus. That it occurs in the present tense indicates that in both cases eternal principles of God's saving purpose are being enunciated. In other words, as God was not ashamed of Abraham, so also He is not ashamed of men in any generation who exhibit the qualities of Abraham; as Jesus in His earthly life was not ashamed to call men His brothers (compare, for example, Matt. 25:40, 28:10; Mark 3:34 and John 20:17), so also the offer to share in His brotherhood is extended to men of all ages.

---

[17] Ibid., p. 307.

[18] Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Ethics (New York: Macmillan Co., 1955), p. 332, says that "For the New Testament the polis is an eschatological concept; it is the future city of God, the new Jerusalem, the heavenly society under the rule of God."

The verb kaleō likewise occurs in both passages, indicating the familiarity which exists between God and man.[19] God is the object of man's calling in 11:16, and Christ is the subject of the calling in 2:11. The former indicates the accessibility which men, in spite of the vast difference between humanity and divinity, have to God by virtue of faith; and the latter indicates the divine initiative which resulted in the incarnation of Christ.

The occurrence of the shame concept in Heb. 2:11 cannot be considered apart from the Christology of the entire letter.[20] Two contrasts which occur repeatedly in Hebrews receive especial stress in the section 2:5-18. The words "divinity" and "humanity" express well the essence of the one contrast, while the terms "glory" and "humiliation" give meaning to the other.[21] The lack of shame predicted of Christ in 2:11, then, is shown (1) in the assumption of human nature by One Who is in essence divine, and (2) in the abandonment of the glory which is His by nature for the humiliation of earthly life.

---

[19]This familiarity has two aspects; first, the closeness and accessibility to God which men have by virtue of faith (cf. Heb. 4:16), and secondly the familiarity which results from sonship (2:11).

[20]While the Christology of the author of Hebrews possesses certain unique aspects, it also shares certain emphases with both Paul and John. Westcott, p. 424, for example, says: "The view of the Person and Work of Christ which is given in the Epistle to the Hebrews is in many respects more comprehensive and far-reaching than that which is given in any other Book of the New Testament. The writer does not indeed, like St. John, trace back the conception of the Personality of the Lord to immanent relations in the Being of a Living God. He does not, like St. Paul, distinctly represent each believer as finding his life 'in Him' and so disclose the divine foundation of the solidarity of the human race. But both thoughts are implicitly included in his characteristic teaching on the High-priestly office of Christ through which humanity reaches the end of creation."

[21]The author of Hebrews stresses not only the contrast between these two words, but also the close relationship between Christ's humiliation and His consequent glory. This close relationship is evident, e.g., in the use

Nowhere in the New Testament is the humanity of Christ set forth so movingly as in the epistle to the Hebrews.[22] Few passages delineate the purpose and meaning of the incarnation so eloquently as Heb. 2:14-18:

> The children of a family share the same flesh and blood; and so he too shared ours, so that through death he might break the power of him who had death at his command, that is, the devil; and might liberate those who, through fear of death, had all their lifetime been in servitude. It is not angels, mark you, that he takes to himself, but the sons of Abraham. And therefore he had to be made like these brothers of his in every way, so that he might be merciful and faithful as their high priest before God, to expiate the sins of the people. For since he himself has passed through the test of suffering, he is able to help those who are meeting their test now. (NEB)

Two verbs--koinōneō and metechō--are used to describe participation in humanity, the first applied to the sons of God and the second to the Son of God. The significant difference is conveyed not so much by the verbs employed,[23] but by the tense in which they occur. Kekoinōnēken (perfect) marks the common nature ever shared among men as long as the race lasts; meteschen (aorist) expresses the unique fact of the Incarnation as a voluntary acceptance of humanity.[24] The same truth, further developed in 4:14-5:4, is expressed by the statement that "he had to be made like (homoiōthēnai) his brothers in every respect (kata panta)."

The genuineness and the fullness of Christ's humanity is made explicit by the mention of blood and flesh in verse 14. He became a partner in

---

of eprepen in verse 10, and also in the statement that Jesus was crowned with glory and honor "because of the suffering of death," verse 9.

[22]Cf. Vincent Taylor, The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching (London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1959), pp. 89-98.

[23]Bruce, in a note on page 41, states that it would be precarious to press a distinction between the two verbs; Moffatt, p. 34, sees no distinction of meaning between the two, while Westcott, p. 54, takes the opposing view.

[24]Westcott, p. 52.

humanity "in like manner" as other men--namely by the gateway of physical birth. "No docetic or Apollinarian Christ will satisfy men's need of a Savior or God's determination to supply that need."[25]

The truth of the incarnation is further emphasized by a comparison of the nature of humans with that of angels in 2:9 and 2:16. The first passage, referring to Psalm 8, states that Jesus was made lower (ēlattōmenon) than the angels for a little while,[26] a reference to his assumption of human nature. The second states that Christ did not take on Himself the nature of angels, but that of the seed of Abraham.[27]

The purpose of the Incarnation is twofold--the destruction through death of the prince of death, and the liberation of those who have been in lifelong bondage to the fear of death (verses 14 and 15). In order to accomplish this Christ assumed human nature and thus "the full connexion of 'the Son' and 'the sons' was realized."[28]

The assumption of humanity is but one aspect of the humiliation which characterized the entire life of Christ and culminated in His death on the cross. The reason that He can be of help to His brothers in the flesh is the fact that "he himself has suffered and been tempted" (2:18). The temptation which He endured corresponds to the experience of all humans in that He was tempted "in every respect as we are," but differs

---

[25]Bruce, p. 48.

[26]For the change in meaning of ti brachy between LXX and this passage see the commentaries ad. loc.

[27]The passage presents a problem, revolving around the precise meaning of the word epilambanō, which may mean (1) to take to oneself, or (2) to help. The commentators, as well as the translations, differ in their interpretation.

[28]Westcott, p. 52.

in that He did not yield to temptation by sinning, 4:15. Because of His sharing our nature, our temptations, our suffering, He is a merciful, faithful, and sympathetic high priest on our behalf (4:14-15, 2:17-18).

Two points should be mentioned concerning the relation between the incarnation and the death of Christ. (1) The incarnation made possible the humiliation of Christ's death, and for this reason the necessity of the incarnation is stressed. "Indeed, this is stated here as the purpose of His incarnation--that He should die, and in the very act of dying draw the sting of death."[29] (2) The crucifixion is viewed as the culmination of the humiliation which began at Bethlehem, a part of the same divine drama. The author of Hebrews does not, however, look upon the death of Christ as a tragedy, but as the natural result and outcome of the incarnation, perfectly in accord with God's will. The shameful aspect of the death of Christ is rather revealed in the manner in which He died.[30]

As testimony for the fact that Jesus is not ashamed to call men his brothers, the author cites three passages from the Old Testament (2:12-13), which

> develope [sic] the main idea of the section, that of Christ fulfilling the destiny of men through suffering, by recalling typical utterances of representative men: (1) of the suffering, innocent king; (2) of the representative prophet.[31]

Both ruler and prophet identify themselves with their people.

The first quotation is taken from Psalm 22, a Messianic psalm frequently quoted in the New Testament: "I will proclaim thy name to my

---

[29]Bruce, p. 49.

[30]Infra, pp. 38-40.

[31]Westcott, p. 50.

brethren, in the midst of the congregation I will praise thee." The entire psalm gives content to the nature and depth of Christ's suffering as a human being. His brothers are such by virtue of a common humanity and by virtue of the fact that they also share in the same divine deliverance of which the psalmist speaks.[32]

The two remaining quotations are from Is. 8:17-18.[33] The context of the passage is revealing. Isaiah, finding that his oracles meet with no response from king or people, seals them up and hands them over to his disciples for safe keeping in order that, when their fulfillment comes, it may be made apparent that what he has spoken was the true word of God. In the words "I will put my trust in Him," the prophet "declares his personal faith on God in the midst of judgments."[34]

Moffatt says that "The fact that Jesus required to put faith in God proves that he was a human being like ourselves," and observes that for Philo trustful hope towards God is "the essential mark of humanity."[35]

In the final quotation,[36] "Here am I, and the children God has given me," the prophet stands forth with his children

---

[32]Moffatt, p. 33, quotes Justin Martyr (Dial. 106) who says that Ps. 22:22-23 foretells how the risen Jesus stood in the midst of his brethren, the apostles, and with them sang a hymn to God. Moffatt adds that "The Son associates himself with his adelphoi in the praise of God offered by their community (a thought which is echoed in 12:28 and 13:15)."

[33]The close proximity of the two make it almost certain that this is the passage which the author of Hebrews had in mind. It should be mentioned however that the Septuagint readings of 2 Sam. 22:3 and Is. 12:2 are almost identical with Is. 8:17.

[34]Westcott, p. 51.

[35]Moffatt, p. 33.

[36]While the two sentences from Is. 8:17-18 appear in immediate sequence, the author of Hebrews separates them with "And again." Westcott, p. 51, correctly remarks that they are thus separated because they "represented two aspects of the typical prophet in his relation to Christ."

> as representing "the remnant," the seed of the Church in Israel. The representative of God rests in his heavenly Father, and he is not alone: his children are already with him to continue the divine revelation.[37]

The presence of Isaiah and his offspring in Jerusalem, as well as their significant names, were intended to remind the people of the dominant themes of his message. The quotation affirms the solidarity of Christ not now by means of the term "brethren" as in verses 11 and 12, but by means of the term "children."[38]

Hebrews 12:2-4

While Heb. 11:16 and 2:11 stress the eternal principles of God's gracious dealings with men, Heb. 12:2-4 focuses our attention on an unrepeatable event which happened in a specific location and at a particular time in the parade of human history. Considering the sacrificial background of Hebrews, it is only natural that the crucifixion is singled out for special mention. Jesus, the pioneer and perfecter of faith, "endured the cross, despising the shame," hypemeinen stauron aischynēs kataphronēsas.[39] Certain observations may be made regarding the shame which is attached to crucifixion:

---

[37]Westcott, p. 51.

[38]Bruce, p. 48.

[39]The paraphrase of Phillips "thought nothing of its shame" and the translation of NEB, "making light of its disgrace" would seem to imply that Jesus was not fully aware of the shame attached to crucifixion, or merely overlooked the humiliation of such a shameful death. The text suggests rather that He was fully cognizant of both the horrible torture and the stinging indignity of the cross. Moffatt, p. 197, says "Jesus was sensitive to such emotions; he felt disgrace keenly. But instead of allowing these feelings to cling to his mind, he rose above them. This is the force of kataphronēsas here."

1. The author does not intend to limit the shame to the crucifixion alone, but also to include the disgrace and humiliation which preceded the act of crucifixion. The taunting, scourging, and crowning with thorns, as well as the more bitter agony of rejection, desertion and dereliction, are all included.[40]

2. Crucifixion was a punishment practiced by the Phoenicians and Persians.[41] It was not the Jewish mode of punishment and, although Jannaeus on one occasion had crucified no less than eight hundred persons in Jerusalem[42] even cruel Herod did not resort to the practice.[43] The Romans did not employ crucifixion until after the time of Caesar, but citizens of Rome were exempt from this form of execution,[44] it being reserved for slaves and foreigners. It was considered a grim deterrent to others and as a punishment "for men of whom the world felt it was well rid."[45] During the last siege of Jerusalem it was particularly common.

3. "The shame was emphasized by the custom of compelling the victim to carry the cross or at least the transverse part of it to the place of

---

[40]Cf. Bruce, p. 352.

[41]A Theological Word Book of the Bible, edited by Alan Richardson (New York: MacMillan Co., 1960), p. 57.

[42]Josephus, Antiquities 13, 14:2, War 1, 4, 6.

[43]The normal mode of execution was stoning, though dead bodies were hanged to the accursed tree (Deut. 21:33). Cf. Alfred Edersheim, The Life and Times of Jesus The Messiah (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1956), II, 583.

[44]Bruce, p. 352, quotes Cicero as follows: "Let the very mention of the cross be far removed not only from a Roman citizen's body, but from his mind, his eyes, his ears."

[45]Moffatt, p. 197.

execution and by his being stripped of his clothes."[46] Edersheim states that the procession to the place of execution was commonly accompanied with the proclamation of a herald, and took the longest road to the place of execution; he suggests, however, that these indignities were dispensed with in the case of Jesus.[47]

4. The Gospel accounts relate that, in addition to the physical suffering, the Savior was subjected to gibes and taunting not only from those who had procured His death but also from passersby and those crucified with Him. There was the added shame which one would have felt from meeting such an end in the presence of mother and followers.

Moffatt correctly observes that it is not so much the horrible torture involved that the author of Hebrews had in mind, but the "stinging indignity" of the cross.[48] Christ had undergone in fact "that punishment, which under the law betokened the curse of God,"[49] as St. Paul points out in Gal. 3:13. The irony of it all lies in the fact that this was the will of God. The cross of Calvary stands as the ultimate evidence that God is not ashamed to identify with humankind, and in that supreme event Christ's recognition of God's children as His brothers acquires true meaning. The phrase "pioneer and perfecter of our faith," tēs pisteōs archēgos kai

---

[46] A Theological Word Book of the Bible, p. 57.

[47] Edersheim, II, 583.

[48] Moffatt, p. 197.

[49] J. B. Lightfoot, The Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1962). Paul is careful, however, as Lightfoot points out, to omit the words of the Old Testament quotation which would have implied that Christ was cursed "by God." See especially the detached note on "The interpretation of Deut. 21:23," pp. 152-54.

teleiōtes, 12:2, points up the twofold significance of the cross in the mind of the author. As perfecter of the faith Christ has brought to completion God's saving plan for men. As pioneer, He has set an example for those who follow Him of the attitude Christians should possess toward the things of this world.

The Nature of Christian Faith

C. H. Dodd contends that there existed in the early church "testimony-books" which contained large sections of the Old Testament frequently quoted by New Testament authors.[50] One of these sections which constituted "the Bible of the early Church" was Is. 6:1-9:7. One verse from this section (8:14) was frequently linked with Is. 28:16 due to the coincidence of the word "stone."

Is. 28:16 is of importance to our study because the Septuagint version contains the shame concept and is quoted three times in the New Testament--Rom. 9:33, 10:11; and 1 Peter 2:6. Before commenting on the significance of this passage for an understanding of Christian faith, it is necessary to note the difference between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint, as well as the slightly different ways in which Peter and Paul use the quotation.

The Masoretic Text, as translated in the Revised Standard Version, reads, "He who believes will not be in haste." The Septuagint translators rendered the phrase "will not be in haste" with "will not be put to shame," ou mē kataischynthē. Opinion differs as to the appropriateness

---

[50]C. H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures, The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology (London: James Nisbet and Co. Ltd., 1961), pp. 126-27.

of the translation.[51] E. G. Selwyn, who presents a study of the problem, concludes that both Paul and Peter were dependent on a common document, either "an early Christian hymn or rhythmical prayer."[52]

The two New Testament authors appeal to Is. 28:16 to illustrate slightly different truths. Paul's use occurs in his lengthy digression regarding the unbelief of Israel. While the Gentile has attained the righteousness of faith, the Jew has failed because he pursued a righteousness based on works (9:30-10:4). The contrast, then, is between the acceptance of Christ by the Gentiles and His rejection by the Jews. In Peter there is no indication of a Jewish-Gentile tension. The contrast rather is drawn between the believer and the unbeliever, the passage intended as an encouragement to Christians who are undergoing persecution for the sake of the gospel.

To point up the significance of the nature of Christian faith for the New Testament teaching on shame the various components of the statement "He who believes in him will not be put to shame" are briefly analyzed.

1. Pas. The addition of "every one" as a modifier of "he who believes" occurs only at Rom. 10:11. The adjective does not occur in

---

[51]Charles Bigg, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1961), p. 130 maintains that the Masoretic Text is "not in itself badly represented" by the Septuagint rendering. William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895), p. 281, feel, on the other hand, that the quotation in Peter and Paul is either "an incorrect translation of the Hebrew or based on a different reading." R. B. Y. Scott, The Interpreter's Bible (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), V, 318, conjectures that the statement "He who believes will not make haste" was an inscription written on the stone to which Is. 28:16 refers.

[52]Edward Gordon Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter (London: MacMillan & Co. Ltd., 1961), pp. 268-77. His reconstruction of the hymn is found on p. 277.

the Septuagint rendering, and Paul's insertion of it at this point sheds light on his view of Christian faith. The point of the argument in verses 11 to 13 is that the method by which the Gentiles attained righteousness--namely by faith--is the final revelation of God's saving will for all men, Jew or Greek. The old system of righteousness based on law has been done away with in Christ. The Gospel has a universal character applicable to all men.

2. Ho pisteuōn, "He who believes." Pistis, faith, is the distinctive New Testament word to indicate a right relationship with God. Christian faith consists in recognizing Jesus as Lord; it is the acceptance of and submission to "the way of salvation determined by God and made accessible in Christ."[53] As such, both the idea of trust and that of obedience are involved. Ernest De Witt Burton remarks the significance of the word "faith" in the thought of Paul:

> Two elements of the apostle Paul's conception of faith are worthy of special attention. On the one hand, he conceived of faith in Christ as issuing in a vital fellowship of the believer with Christ, by which Christ becomes the compelling and controlling force in the believer's moral life (Galatians 2:20, 5:6). On the other hand, he laid great stress upon the essential identity of such faith in God as existed in the Old Testament period and the Christian type of faith. The doctrine of faith in Christ is defended by an appeal to the faith of Abraham, and the permanence and continuity of the principle of faith as the determinative element of God's demand upon men urgently maintained. The union of these two elements in his idea of Christian faith, viz., its higher possibilities and normal destiny, and its essential identity with the more primitive faith of an older period is an important fact for the understanding of his thought.[54]

---

[53]See Rudolf Bultmann in Bible Key Words, III (New York: Harper and Row, 1961), Part I, 87.

[54]Ernest De Witt Burton, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1921), p. 484.

3. The phrase ep' auto, "in him," is not contained in the Hebrew text and is absent from the B text of the Septuagint. Both Peter and Paul include it in their quotation and, as the context in each case indicates, it stresses the element of loyalty to the person Jesus Christ. Judaism had already interpreted this passage in a Messianic sense,[55] and both Peter and Paul apply it directly and specifically to Jesus as the Stone. The characterization of Jesus as a stone seems to have derived originally from a logion attributed to Jesus Himself (Mark 12:10 and parallels) which quotes Ps. 118:22-23. Peter refers to the same passage when speaking before the Jewish rulers and elders (Acts 4:11). Other Septuagint passages containing the word lithos, stone, and capable of a Messianic interpretation (Is. 8:14 and 28:16) soon came to be applied to Jesus. Sanday and Headlam claim that in Eph. 2:20 "akrogōniaiou is used almost as a proper name" and, following a quotation from Justin Martyr, state that "lithos was a name for the Messiah among the Jews, and Justin wishes to prove that Christ fulfills that title, and this seems to be corroborated by quotations from Jewish writings, not only in later books but even earlier.[56]

4. Ou mē kataischynthē, "will not be put to shame."[57] The person, whoever he may be, that through faith commits himself to Jesus Christ, will not be put to shame. As Rom. 5:5 points out "Hope does not make

---

[55]Cf. Franz J. Leenhardt, The Epistle to the Romans (London: Lutterworth Press, 1964), p. 263. Sanday and Headlam, p. 281, give the details.

[56]Sanday and Headlam, p. 281. John Hall Elliott, The Elect and the Holy: An Exegetical Examination of 1 Peter 2:4-10 and the Phrase Basileron Hierateuma (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966), pp. 16-49, has given careful attention to the lithos tradition in the biblical and its contemporary literature.

[57]Paul deviates slightly from the Septuagint reading, but the difference is not significant.

ashamed" (Hē de elpis ou kataischynei). The point here is that God will not desert the one who trusts in Him. Both the faithfulness of God and His power are involved. God will not hide His face from the one who has accepted Him and trusted in Him. Nor will He condemn the one who looks to Him for help and aid in days of darkness.

The Emergence of a New Community

Those who put their trust in God and give their loyalty to Christ form a new community, distinct from the Jewish community from which it sprang and separate from the pagan communities within which they reside. Two passages from 1 Peter point out the uniqueness of this community, the first in the reinterpretation of titles applied to Israel in the Old Testament, the second in the application of a new and distinctive term.

1 Peter 2:4-10

This section has already been dealt with immediately above in connection with the nature of Christian faith. Our concern at present is the list of titles occurring in verse 9, titles reflecting the position of Israel in the Old Testament revelation but reinterpreted and reapplied to the new Christian community. The passage clearly reveals the Christian community's insistence that there is an "unbroken continuity between Israel and this newly established people of God,"[58] and at the same time the paramount importance of the "relationship between the believers and Jesus."[59]

---

[58]Howard Clark Kee and Franklin W. Young, Understanding the New Testament (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1957), p. 54.

[59]Elliott, p. 214.

Like Israel of old the new community had tasted that the Lord is gracious (2:3), have obtained mercy at His hand and are thus constituted a new people of God (2:10). Unlike Israel, the Christian community recognizes Jesus Christ as the final and ultimate expression of God's grace and mercy; in loyalty to Christ, the rejected but precious stone, they find the cohesion which binds their community together and makes it one. Membership in the community is no longer determined by race, status, or the outward rite of circumcision, but only by a faith which never causes shame (2:6).

The four titles for the people of God which find fulfillment in the Christian community will be briefly examined.

1. Genos eklekton, "a chosen race." The specific Old Testament reference is Is. 43:20, where the noun genos is used in reference to Israel. The New Testament frequently applies the same word to the Jewish people, for example, at Gal. 1:14, Phil. 3:5, 2 Cor. 11:26, and Acts 7:19.[60] Although it is used of Christians quite generally at a later date,[61] the New Testament application of the noun to the Christian community is limited to this passage. Ordinarily it denoted blood-relation, and is "applied to the Christians as members of one family through the new birth; cf. i. 23."[62]

The adjective "chosen" lays stress upon God's mercy and sovereign will as the operative factor in the election both of Israel and of the Christian community. Israel had nothing to commend herself, but God

---

[60]Friedrich Büchsel, "Genos," TDNT, I, 685.

[61]Infra, pp. 52-53.

[62]Bigg, p. 134.

nonetheless chose her[63] as a testimony to the nations. Likewise God has chosen the weak and the foolish and the things which are not in order to shame the wise and the strong (1 Cor. 1:27).

2. Basileion Hierateuma, "a royal priesthood." These words, applied to Israel in Ex. 19:6, find their fulfillment in the Christian community in spite of the fact that no order of priests existed in the early church.[64] The emphasis lies therefore on the function of the community. The expression "says positively what 'chosen race' has said negatively: the Church of Christ is chosen for a royal priesthood."[65] The vocation of the church had already been described as "priesthood" in verse 5 where the two ideas of representation and accessibility are present. Selwyn remarks the former idea when he observes that "the Christian Church is a priesthood because it bears the same relation to mankind as the Jewish priesthood bore to the whole people of Israel."[66] The accessibility which the Christian enjoys on the basis of his relationship with God finds expression in the fact that he, like the priest, can stand unashamedly before God (1 John 2:28).

---

[63]Johannes Blauw, The Missionary Nature of the Church: A Survey of the Biblical Theology of Mission (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962), p. 23, has pointed out that "the word election and choice in the Old Testament, whenever it refers to Israel, is always used in the active, never in the passive form." This fact emphasizes the initiative of Jahwe and the passivity of Israel.

[64]Francis Wright Beare, The First Epistle of Peter (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958), pp. 103-4. This is the more remarkable, as the same author points out, in view of the fact that Israel had its priestly order, as well as the imperial religion and the mystery religions, with which Christianity was frequently in competitive opposition.

[65]Blauw, p. 129.

[66]Selwyn, p. 160. Cf. especially his further treatment of the same concept in his additional note, "The 'Spiritual House,' its Priesthood and Sacrifices, in ii. 5-9," pp. 285-98.

The designation of this spiritual priesthood as royal is problematical. Whether basileion is to be interpreted as a substantive equivalent to "kingdom" or as an adjective meaning "royal" is not entirely clear,[67] and there is in addition a question as to the propriety of the Septuagint rendering of the Hebrew text.[68] The explanation of its significance suggested by Bigg seems as likely as any: "The hierateuma is royal because it belongs to the King, who has chosen it as His own possession, and because, therefore, it shares in His glory; not because the hiereis are themselves kings, and shall reign upon earth."[69]

3. Ethnos hagion, "a holy nation." This description of Christians is also taken from Ex. 19:6. The noun--which in the Septuagint translates the Hebrew goy--is not usually applied to the Jewish people; rather it connotes the religious and moral inferiority in the Gentiles which the Jews took for granted.[70] That holiness could be predicated of the Gentiles was, for the Jew, a contradiction in terms. Blauw refers to the expression as "a wholly unusual combination," and says that "A 'holy Gentile people' is really a contradiction, but this human impossibility has been made a divine reality in Christ."[71]

---

[67]Selwyn, p. 165-66, presents the evidence for both views, and opts for the former.

[68]Beare, p. 104, describes the LXX rendering as a mistranslation of the Hebrew, but conjectures that "the LXX translators may have had a different text before them."

[69]Bigg, p. 134.

[70]William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 217.

[71]Blauw, pp. 130-31.

The Hebrew word for holy was originally a cultic term, likely derived from a root denoting separation.[72] The Greek hagios also possessed a cultic character, but by the time of the New Testament this aspect has weakened. Rather the two dominant ideas are consecration for God's service and that of purity.[73] The church, then, is holy because it is composed of members who have renounced their sins and separated themselves from their former lives of obedience to serve the living God.

4. Laos eis peripoiēsin, "God's own people." The phrase is reminiscent of a number of Old Testament passages, notably Ex. 19:5 and Mal. 3:17 (compare also 7:6, 14:2, and 26:18).[74] The word laos is particularly instructive of the manner in which the church appropriated the titles of Israel. In sharp distinction to ethnos, the word usually appears as a technical term for Israel.[75] Like genos, it is never applied to the church except in quotation from or allusion to the Old Testament.[76] The parallelism is clear: As God had called the descendants of Abraham from bondage in Egypt and formed a people, so also He has called those of various tribes and tongues from the slavery of sin to form a new people, bound together by a different bond, faith in Christ Jesus.

---

[72]Edmond Jacob, Theology of the Old Testament (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1958), p. 86.

[73]Cf. Otto Proksch, "Hagios," TDNT, I, 88.

[74]The precise phrase is not found in the LXX, but Selwyn, p. 166, says that the rendering of the New Testament text is a "very good paraphrase" of the passages listed above.

[75]In translation of the Hebrew 'am. Cf. Blauw, p. 131.

[76]Büchsel, I, 685.

This new people, composed of various racial elements, is God's own possession.

> Peripoiēsis would describe the action of a boy who collects curios, gadgets, knives, etc., which becomes his special treasures. Israel had been the object of God's special affection in a similar way, and this affection was now transferred to the Christian Church.[77]

The rapid growth and spread of the new religious community soon brought it to the attention of--and into conflict with--the authorities. The following quote is instructive in that it demonstrates the attitude toward religious groups in the ancient world, and at the same time explains the persecution of which the church became the object.

> There is considerable boldness in the language which describes the Christian Church as a genos, ethnos, laos--"a race," "a nation," "a people"--when in literal fact it embraced members of many different races and nations--in principle, indeed, members of "all races and peoples and kindreds and tongues" (Apoc. 7:9). Yet it must be remembered that there was a distinct tendency in the ancient world to think of religion as the essential basis of community, and of common religious observances as the determining feature of nationhood and the one really significant factor of homogeneity. . . . When men withdrew purposefully and openly from participation in the rites of the official religion, as Christians were bound to do, then they ceased to be members of the community in any effective sense; the old ties of social relationship were broken. Negatively, therefore, those who became Christians had no more part in the race or nation of their birth; and positively, they formed new ties, and were united in a new community which was less a private brotherhood like those of the mystery-religions, than the unifying bond of all existence which we find in the nation or state.[78]

1 Peter 4:14-16

Not only were the Old Testament titles of Israel appropriated by the New Testament community, but a new and distinctive title was also

---

[77]Selwyn, p. 167.

[78]Beare, p. 102.

applied to and accepted by the disciples of Jesus. The shame concept--both the oneidos and the aischynē roots--appear together with the name "Christian" at 1 Peter 4:14-16.

> If you are reproached (ei oneidizesthe) for the name of Christ, you are blessed, because the spirit of glory and of God rests upon you. But let none of you suffer as a murderer, or a thief, or a wrongdoer, or a mischief-maker; yet if one suffers as a Christian, let him not be ashamed (mē aischynesthō), but under that name let him glorify God.

St. Luke tells us (Acts 11:26) that the disciples were for the first time called Christians in the city of Antioch. The term did not originate within the brotherhood itself, for--as F. F. Bruce correctly observes--the term is never used in the New Testament by Christians of themselves.[79] Nor did the appellation originate among the Jews, whose nickname for the followers of Jesus was Nazōraioi (compare Acts 24:5). The name rather originated among the pagan inhabitants of Antioch, among whom there was some confusion between Christos and Chrēstus. The latter term, meaning "good, useful," apparently seemed to them a more appropriate name for a religious leader.[80]

The followers of Jesus, however, were not offended by the name applied to them. They were, after all, disciples of Jesus of Nazareth, whom they accepted as Christ and Lord. There is a tacit approval of the term in the three instances where it occurs in the New Testament,[81] and

---

[79]F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles (London: Tyndale Press, 1951), p. 238. The phraseology "as a Christian" at 1 Peter 4:16 seems to reflect the wording of an official document of accusation against the Christians.

[80]Cf. the original reading of Codex Sinaiticus at Acts 11:26, and also Suetonius, Claudius 25:4.

[81]In addition to Acts 11:26 and 1 Peter 4:16, it also appears on the lips of King Herod Agrippa at Acts 26:28.

its frequent use in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers testifies to its early acceptance.[82]

The words of verse 14 are reminiscent of the beatitude spoken by our Lord at Matt. 5:11, and the author of 1 Peter no doubt had it in mind when he wrote. The date of the epistle and the precise nature of the persecution endured by its recipients are much in dispute,[83] but are not of decisive importance to our study. The important thing is that Christians were undergoing persecution en onomati Christou,[84] and are exhorted not to display shame at the name by which they are called. "By demonstrating under trial the true significance of this name, they will glorify God and teach others to glorify Him."[85]

The absence of shame which is to be displayed in the face of persecution finds frequent expression in the New Testament. The entire list of passages dealt with in the last section of the next chapter[86] serve as a commentary on 1 Peter 4:14-16. Rather than considering the shame resulting

---

[82]Ignatius to the Rom. 3:2 is a good example: "Pray for me for strength, both inward and outward, that I may not merely speak, but also have the will, that I may not only be called a Christian, but may also be found to be one. For if I be found to be one, I can also be called one, and then be deemed faithful when I no longer am visible in the world."

[83]Beare, for example, follows Sir William Ramsay in assigning a date during the reign of Trajan (98-117 A.D.), while Pliny the Younger was governor of Bithynia and Pontus, and Christians were officially persecuted propter nomen ipsum (cf. 4:14). Selwyn, on the other hand, and Bigg both assign a date prior to A.D. 64, and emphasize the unofficial nature of the persecution.

[84]Bigg, p. 176, points out that this is the only passage in the New Testament where onoma Christou occurs. Selwyn, p. 225, deals with the grammatical difficulties.

[85]Beare, p. 167.

[86]Infra, pp. 65-67.

from the "indignity of arrest, conviction, and sentence on a criminal charge," the people to whom Peter writes are to consider "the honour that may be done to God in glorifying Him by a steadfast confession."[87]

The passage contrasts the suffering which may result from murder, theft or the commission of some other crime with reproach endured "as a Christian for the name of Christ." Even though the accusing authority may in both cases be the same, even though the gravity of being a Christian may compare in the eyes of those authorities with other crimes, even though the sentence pronounced may be of equal severity, the display of shame in the one case is nonetheless appropriate while in the other it is not.[88] Indirectly, therefore, this passage also testifies to the submission which the New Testament community required of its members to the duly-constituted authorities (compare 1 Peter 2:13-17 and Rom. 13:1-7). A Christian may appear before the bar of justice without shame only when the accusation against him is the result of his loyalty to Christ.

The distinctiveness of the Christian community gave birth somewhat later to their being referred to as a tertium genus, a third race. Like "Christian," the term did not originate within the community but was nonetheless adopted by early Christian writers as an indication of their "political and historical self-consciousness."[89] The Jews--because of

---

[87]Beare, p. 167.

[88]Infra, p. 83, where attention is drawn to the emphasis upon proper and improper shame which occurs especially in Old Testament Wisdom literature.

[89]Adolf Harnack, The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961), p. 240. Harnack examines the term in relation to the Church's consciousness of being a new people (pp. 240-65), and includes an excursus entitled, "Christians as a Third Race, in the Judgment of Their Opponents," (pp. 266-78).

their imageless worship, stubborn refusal to participate in other cults, and exclusiveness--were distinguished throughout the Roman empire "as a special people in contrast to all others."[90] When Christianity became a force within the empire, the question arose whether or not it was a new religion and whether or not it was to share in the privileges accorded the Jewish people. The Jews, moved by an almost fanatical hostility to the new movement, refused to associate with them. As Bishop Stephen Neill observes: "The Christians might claim to be the true Israel; the Jews would make it plain that the old Israel was very much alive and that Christians had no part nor lot in it."[91] The term "third race," then, though imposed by the juridical situation in the Roman Empire, was nonetheless "a penetrating perception of the true situation and character of the Church."[92]

That shame is a social force, its nature and function determined by a particular society or group, has already been observed and shall be mentioned again.[93] The emergence of the Christian community and the recognition by her members of its distinctiveness and uniqueness is therefore of great consequence to our study.

---

[90]Ibid., p. 266. Harnack, who provides references to the pertinent contemporary literature, observes that the uniqueness of the Jews was acknowledged by the legislation of Caesar and that except for a brief period, the Jews were never expected to worship the emperor (pp. 266-67).

[91]Stephen Neill, The Interpretation of the New Testament: 1861-1961 (London: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 184.

[92]Beare, p. 103.

[93]Infra, pp. 105-9.

CHAPTER IV

THE NATURE AND FUNCTION OF SHAME IN THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY

Occupation and Status

The attitude of the New Testament toward the occupation and status of an individual is conditioned by three factors. The first is an acceptance of the fact that all men are not created equal. Due to divine design there is male and female. By accident of birth some are Jews, while others are Gentiles, Greeks or barbarians. This pattern is operative not only in social life, but also in the church.[1] The Pauline pictures of the church as a body (1 Cor. 12:12-31) and a building (Eph. 2:19-22) serve to emphasize the diversity of the individual as well as the unity of the whole.

The second factor is a positive emphasis upon man as man. Through creation a certain honor has been bestowed upon the human race, an honor which derives directly from God. To degrade or humiliate the possessor of this God-given honor is an affront not only to man, but also to the God in whose image he was created.

There is thirdly a recognition of the ties by which one man is related to and associated with another. Wherever such ties and relationships are legitimate--as for example between parents and children, husbands and wives, king and subjects, master and slave--they are to be

---

[1] On a religious plane, of course, all men stand equally convicted before God (Rom. 2:1-3:20) and in Christ all the faithful receive with Abraham an equal share in God's inheritance (Gal. 3:26-29). On a social level, however, even within the Christian community the distinction of sex, nationality and economic status remain.

observed and not destroyed. The numerous sections in the New Testament which deal with such relationships serve as a commentary on the injunction of St. Peter to "honor all men" (1 Peter 2:17).

These factors must be kept in mind as we examine the New Testament passages dealing with shame in connection with one's occupation or status in life.

At least two passages testify to the fact that persons are to be treated respectfully even if they are poor.[2] By the disorderly conduct which prevailed at the Corinthian agape-feasts, the poor were put to shame, 1 Cor. 11:22, Kataischynete tous mē echontas. Paul will not praise the congregation for their practice not only because it detracts from the solemnity of the Eucharist, but also because it degrades the fellow-Christian of humble means.

And St. James delivers a scathing denunciation (2:1-9) of those who practice "respect of persons." By giving preferential treatment to the rich, the poor Christian is deprived of the honor which belongs to him, ētimasate ton ptōchon. Such action is directly contrary to that of God Himself, who does not show respect of persons. Rather, He has chosen the poor to be rich in faith[3] and puts to shame the wise and rich and high-born of this world (1 Cor. 1:27).

---

[2]This honor applies not only to the spiritual aspect of man's existence, but also to his physical existence. J. B. Lightfoot, Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1957), p. 215, has pointed out that there is an entirely different attitude toward the body in the New Testament than in Greek philosophy. He says, "It was the fashion of the Platonists and Stoics to speak contemptuously of the body, but in Christian theology the body is glorified because it is destined to be conformed to Christ's glorified body."

[3]An interesting interpretation of the relationship between the rich Christian and the poor Christian is given in The Shepherd of Hermas' parable of the elm and vine (Sim. 2).

Although the New Testament depreciates neither the rich person as such nor the possession of wealth, it does make clear that riches may prove a hindrance to entering the kingdom of God. Four times the adjective aischros, "shameful," is compounded with the word for material gain (1 Tim. 3:8, Titus 1:7, 11 and 1 Peter 5:2). Although the world may make the pursuit of wealth its aim,[4] such an attitude is not to be found among the members of the church. Each of the occurrences of the compound word stresses the fact that the leaders of the church especially are to be free of the desire for wealth.[5] The ideal attitude is that of St. Paul, as expressed in Acts 20:33-35:

> I coveted no one's silver or gold or apparel. You yourselves know that these hands ministered to my necessities, and to those who were with me. In all things I have shown you that by so toiling one must help the weak, remembering the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, "It is more blessed to give than to receive."

The shame which attaches to sterility is remarked both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament. By repeating the words of Rachel (Gen. 30:23) aged Elizabeth bears witness not only to the stigma connected with sterility in the Jewish world, but also to the love and mercy of God in removing such a reproach (oneidos), Luke 1:25.

In spite of what appears to be a universal aversion to begging,[6] it is perhaps noteworthy that the New Testament reflects negatively thereon

---

[4]Walter Lock, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1959), p. 121, presents the contemporary evidence for the fact that the Cretans especially had a bad name for loving money.

[5]Ibid., p. 131, mentions the various ways in which church leaders could exhibit a love of money: (1) Adapting teaching to hearers, (2) Appropriating gifts of the faithful, or (3) Engaging in discreditable trade.

[6]The blind and destitute Oedipus looked upon the fact that he had been forced to beg as the very depth of his degradation (Oedipus at

only once. Contemplating his future in the face of immediate unemployment, the unrighteous steward remarks his inability for physical exertion and his disinclination for begging, epaitein aischynomai, Luke 16:3. It must be remembered, however, that these words appear on the lips of a rather unscrupulous individual. The New Testament in general looks upon beggars as an opportunity to demonstrate love for our fellow man.[7]

A special honor is attached to the profession of a prophet. Our Lord himself bore testimony to the great reverence in which prophets were held in the Jewish world (Mark 6:4 and parallels). A prophet, He said, is not without honor, atimos, except in his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own house.

Finally, the aischynē root is used in connection with a workman (ergatēs) in 2 Tim. 2:15. The young Timothy is exhorted to pattern his ministry after the example of a workman "who will never be put to shame by being shown to have done bad work."[8] A workman would feel shame "when the incompetence or shoddiness of his work is detected," and a Christian teacher should treat God's word and God's people in such a way that he can "unblushingly submit his work for God's approval."[9]

Colonus, 1355-64). A more modern example of the same aversion may be seen in the title emblazoned across the cover of a recent Philippine publication: "The Beggar Problem: Manila's Shame." (Philippines Free Press, September 18, 1965). Cf. also Ps. 108:10 and Sirach 40:28, 30.

[7]Cf. for example Luke 18:35, John 9:8, Acts 3:1-10.

[8]This is assuredly the correct sense, rather than "a workman who is not ashamed of his task or master." Cf. Lock, p. 98.

[9]Donald Guthrie, The Pastoral Epistles (London: Tyndale Press, 1961), p. 147.

Custom and Behavior

In connection with shame two rather diverse tendencies appear in the New Testament concerning customs and behavior. On the one hand it may be observed that the approval or disapproval of society determines whether an act or condition is shameful or not. On the other hand there is an emphasis upon physis, the very nature of things which dictates that some things are inherently shameful while others are innately praiseworthy.

Both tendencies are revealed in the parable recorded in Luke 14:7-11. Dining in the home of a Pharisee, Jesus notices the manner in which His fellow-guests scrambled for the chief seats at dinner. Under the guise of a lesson in table manners, Jesus enunciates a general principle operative in the kingdom of God.[10] There is something inherently shameful in the action of the man who exalts himself by selecting a seat of prominence. The divine economy, by which God directs and regulates human affairs, dictates that such a person will be humbled. God Himself, as portrayed by the host of the parable, will take action which brings shame on the self-important guest. "Everyone who exalts himself will be humbled, and he who humbles himself will be exalted." The person who is compelled to take the last place in shame, meta aischynēs, has transgressed an inviolable law of God's kingdom. The presence of the other guests heightens and intensifies the shame. He has been publicly exposed to

---

[10]George A. Buttrick, The Parables of Jesus (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1928), p. 83, for example, refers to verse 11 as "an axiom of the kingdom." Norval Geldenhuys, Commentary on the Gospel of Luke (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1960), p. 389, observes that Jesus' words were intended not "as mere precepts of etiquette, but as a lesson on eternal truths." Cf. also the independent version of this parable which appears in some manuscripts after Matt. 20:28.

the view of all as one who has violated the words of Prov. 25:6-7. "Do not put yourself forward in the king's presence or stand in the place of the great; for it is better to be told, 'Come up here,' than to be put lower in the presence of the prince." Society adjudges one man of greater honor, entimoteros (verse 8), than another, and to violate the stratification which society establishes is a demonstration of shamelessness.

The transgression of social standards and propriety is also involved in the parable regarding prayer told by Jesus in Luke 11:5-8. To awaken someone at midnight and arouse him with a request for bread violates social practice and standards. Trench misses the point when he attempts to reconcile the action of this person with the humility which is praised in the publican.[11] So also does Morgan when he calls the parable an "account of friendship."[12] The parable explicitly states that the request is granted not because of friendship. It is the utter shamelessness, anaideia, of him who requests and his persistance which breaks down the resolve of the one asked.

The same lesson is taught in another parable in Luke's Gospel, that of the unjust judge, Luke 18:1-8. He is portrayed as a man who "neither feared God nor regarded man," anthrōpon mē entrepomenos. Plummer characterizes him well in the following words: "He had no respect for either the vox Dei or the vox populi, consciously (verse 4) defying Divine commands and public opinion."[13] Here a moral judgment is involved; the

---

[11]Richard C. Trench, Notes on the Parables of Our Lord (Westwood, N. J.: Flemming H. Revell Co., 1953), p. 333.

[12]G. Campbell Morgan, The Parables and Metaphors of Our Lord (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott Ltd., 1956), p. 162.

[13]Alfred Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1953), p. 411.

judge is, to say the least, a scoundrel; and this very fact serves to accentuate the purpose of the entire parable as expressed in verse 2. Because of the importunity of the widow he granted her request, and not because of either religious or humanitarian scruples.[14]

In two other places the New Testament employs the verb entrepō to denote the proper observation of social relationships. In Heb. 12:9 it refers to the respect which children show toward the discipline of their earthly fathers. In the parable of the wicked husbandman (Mark 12:1-12 and parallels) it expresses the respect which they should have had for the son of the householder (entrapēsontai ton huion mou, verse 6). The parable as a whole serves to illustrate the severe consequences which may result on a human scale from a disregard of proper relationships. The husbandmen should also have observed the honor attaching to the servant in verse 4 because he was the representative of their landlord. Their refusal to do so is represented by the verb atimazō.

Two sections from 1 Corinthians illustrate clearly the manner in which social standards and practice effect a consciousness of what is shameful. Dealing with the question of propriety in public worship, St. Paul states that a man who prays with his head covered dishonors his head, kataischynei tēn kephalēn autou, while a woman who prays with her head uncovered likewise dishonors her head (11:4-5). Whatever the

---

[14]Morgan, p. 209 says that "he flaunted both the tables of the ten commandments, the first that revealed relationship with God and the second that revealed relationship with our fellow-beings. He did not care for one or the other."

particular interpretation of this passage,[15] two facts accentuate the truth that the question is merely one of practice and propriety. First of all, the custom observed in the Corinthian congregation is contrary to both Jewish and Greek practice.[16] Furthermore, Paul employs the words tradition, paradosis (11:2), and custom, synētheia (11:16), in this connection, both of which indicate that the practice was not considered as equal to a divine command.[17]

---

[15]Jean Hering, The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians (London: Epworth Press), p. 101, cites but does not accept the view of Johannes Weiss that the women in the congregation formed the nucleus of a group of "libertines" who were giving Paul trouble. As Hering points out, Paul calls to his aid three lines of argument to combat this feminist tendency: "(a) Theological arguments to show that woman, in the order of creation, is farther than man from God. (b) Moral arguments appealing to the rules of propriety and feelings of decency. (c) An argument drawn from angelology."

A second difficulty revolves around the use of the word kephalē. Paul had just stated that Christ is the head of man, and man in turn is the head of the woman (verse 3). In the light of this statement, there is little doubt that Paul is employing the word in verses 4 and 5 in both a literal and a figurative sense.

Hering's hypothesis (p. 104) that in verse 7 a copyist's error transformed dogma, signifying a copy, into doxa, while interesting, is difficult to accept.

[16]Among the Greeks both men and women prayed with heads uncovered while, even to this day, Jewish custom allows men in the synagogue only if their heads are covered. Leon Morris, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians (London: Tyndale Press, 1958), p. 152, points out that the Christians "adopted a distinctive practice of their own," conforming to neither Jewish nor Greek custom.

[17]Although Paul has an extremely high opinion of Christian tradition (cf. 1 Cor. 15:3, 11:23), Frederik Willem Grosheide, Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953), p. 249, is assuredly incorrect when he says that such "constituted the word of God." Hering, p. 101, correctly states that "Paradosis is the oral tradition, either on a point of doctrine, ethics or cult." Cf. also Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955), II, 119-27, and Oscar Cullmann, The Early Church (London: SCM Press, 1956), pp. 55-99.

In the same context (11:6) Paul states that it is shameful, aischros, for a woman to be shaven or shorn. Although the statement is prefaced with an "if" the context shows that this is an accepted view of Paul and the church. In developing his position Paul appeals, verses 14 to 16, to nature, physis,[18] which he says teaches us that it is a shame, atimia, for a man to have long hair, but for a woman long hair is a cause of pride.

Paul also cites as a custom in all the churches of the saints that the woman keep silence (14:33-36). For a woman to speak in the church is shameful, aischros; she should rather be subordinate. While in the case discussed above physis was appealed to, at this point Paul appeals to nomos, "law."[19] Commentators resolve the apparent contradiction with what Paul had said in 11:5 in various ways,[20] but in any case it is clear

---

[18]That Paul should appeal to physis at this particular point seems strange, since, as Morris (p. 155) points out, what Paul mentions regarding length of hair has not always been the case. Three possible interpretations, none of them entirely satisfactory, may be cited. (1) Grosheide, p. 254, states that prostitutes probably "used to or were compelled to cut their hair and keep it very short," and cites Weiss as stating that this was particularly true in the case of unnatural prostitutes. (2) Grosheide, p. 260, also waters down the meaning of physis at 11:14, defining it as "the general notion all people have by virtue of their being human beings." (3) Hering, p. 110, says the following: "we can see only one possible explanation; nature by endowing woman with abundant hair has shown the desire that she should be covered. Civilization should to some extent complete the work of nature by following the direction indicated by nature."

[19]Walter Gutbrod, Bible Key Words, IV (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), Part I, 118, says that here the law is employed to supply by allegorical exegesis an answer to questions concerning community life. But it is noteworthy, he says, that "the argument from the law is not adduced as the decisive proof, but as the confirmation of what has been already recognised as right from other considerations."

[20]Hering, p. 154, resolves the seeming contradiction by saying that 11:5 refers to the worship service proper where the women were allowed to deliver a message while in a state of inspiration, while he applies 14:33-36 to a question-and-answer period which followed the messages delivered by the prophets. Grosheide, pp. 254, 341-43, takes an opposing view, saying that Paul allowed women to prophesy in an informal worship setting, but

that the practice of women assuming a leading role in Christian worship was frowned upon in the early Christian community. Hering correctly remarks that Paul exhibited a "concern not to violate the rules of propriety that were generally observed at the time. We are, then, here in the realm of the relative."[21]

The tendency to view certain actions or objects as honorable or shameful in themselves finds expression primarily in the use of the atimia complex. Honor, timē, is bestowed upon one by virtue of who he is or whom he represents. Because of the very nature of God, He is dishonored when His law is broken (Rom. 2:23). By refusing to recognize Jesus as the representative of His Father, the Jews dishonor Him (atimazete me, John 8:49) and the same verb is used of the action of the wicked husbandmen against the slave of the landholder (Mark 12:4; Luke 20:11). The honor bestowed upon a poor person by virtue of the source from which he came has already been remarked,[22] and this honor extends to the physical body which man possesses.[23]

The same idea is evident in the two passages where Paul speaks of some household vessels as made for honor, eis timēn, and others made for dishonor, eis atimian, Rom. 9:21 and 2 Tim. 2:20. In passing it should be noticed that in each case the author uses the picture to illustrate

---

not at official meetings of the congregation or in public worship. Neither interpretation is entirely satisfactory.

[21]Hering, p. 154.

[22]Supra, p. 54.

[23]For this reason Paul can speak of men dishonoring their bodies (Rom. 1:24). He conceives of the body as possessing a certain honor by virtue of its origin and its destiny.

different truths.[24] The point of concern and interest to us is that both passages portray vessels as noble or shameful by virtue of the purpose for which they are intended.[25] Although vessels may be made of the same material and similar design their designation as "noble" or "shameful" is determined by the use to which they are put.[26]

The apostle employs the same idea in regard to the various organs and members of the body in 1 Cor. 12:14-26. By virtue of the function they perform we esteem certain parts of our body as less honorable, atimotera, and unpresentable, aschemona, 12:23. These parts of the body--usually interpreted as the organs of excretion and reproduction--are treated with greater honor and respect in that we cover them with care and because the functions which they perform are indispensable.[27]

---

[24]In Rom. 9:21 Paul is justifying the action of God in His dealings with Israel and in doing so draws upon a common Old Testament illustration (Is. 29:16, 45:9, 64:7; Jer. 18-20; Wisd. 15:7). In 2 Tim. 2:20 the apostle is encouraging his young co-worker to patience with the varieties of character within the church and to a life of purity in God's service.

[25]On this point see Franz J. Leenhardt, The Epistle to the Romans (London: Lutterworth Press, 1961), p. 256. Although the idea of different materials used in the making of vessels is present in the context of 2 Tim. 2:20, the idea does not extend to the phrase under discussion.

[26]In a similar passage the author of Wisdom speaks of making various objects of the same clay (15:7). The idea of idolatry enters in, however, in that the same potter also molds "counterfeit gods" (15:9) from the same lump of clay from which he molds vessels for useful service.

[27]Some commentators distinguish between the weaker parts (12:22) and the less honorable organs (verse 23). Whether such a distinction is valid seems unimportant since, in any case, the main idea and application of the illustration is clear: In the church, as in the body, every part must work together for the common good.

The Absence of Shame in the Face of Persecution

One of the most distinctive features of the New Testament concept of shame is seen in a reversal of values which takes place when one becomes a Christian. What is considered as intolerably shameful in the Jewish, Greek and Roman world becomes a cause of glory for the citizen of the Christian community.

The explanation of this phenomenon is twofold. The first is the emphasis which the New Testament places on loyalty and faithfulness to the person Jesus Christ. Through Him a new covenant between God and man has been established, and

> The qualitatively new character of the covenant is to be seen in the fact that faithfulness to the person of Jesus determines whether or not one shares in the heavenly blessings, whereas under the old covenant the divine blessing was conditional upon faithfulness to the covenant construed as fulfillment of its demands.[28]

Christ Himself had demanded this loyalty, summoning men to follow Him in spite of the enmity and hatred of the world.

There is secondly in the New Testament a recognition of the fact that following Jesus entails disgrace and suffering. The disciple is not above his Master, and the early Christians exhibited a desire to be like their Master in every respect.[29] Summing up the words of Jesus on

---

[28]Roy A. Harrisville, The Concept of Newness in the New Testament (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1960), p. 47.

[29]Mention should be made here of the fact that the idea of innocent suffering is not absent from the Old Testament. There is a direct line not only from Jesus to His disciples in this regard, but also from the suffering servant of Isaiah and the innocent sufferer of the Psalms to Jesus of Nazareth. It is significant, furthermore, that the concept of innocent suffering predominates and is largely limited to writings which have Christological overtones.

discipleship, two of the points listed by E. Schweizer are that discipleship (a) entails giving up all other ties, to boat and tax-office, to father and mother, in short, to one's own life, to oneself; (b) As Jesus' own way, by divine necessity, leads to rejection, suffering and death, and only so to glory, so also the way of those who follow him.[30]

In the knowledge of what following Jesus meant, the apostles could rejoice "that they were counted worthy to suffer dishonor for the name," hoti katēxiōthēsan hyper tou onomatos atimasthēnai, Acts 5:41. The events narrated in Acts 5:17-40--namely imprisonment, humiliation, and physical beating--comment harshly on what it means to be put to shame for the sake of Christ. The words spoken by the apostles on that occasion, however, sum up a theme and an attitude which runs through the entire New Testament.

With the exception of the instance just cited, the aischynē and oneidos roots are almost always used in this connection. The author of Hebrews twice (11:26, 13:13) speaks of the oneidismos Christou, "the reproach of Christ." As the translation of both the Revised Standard Version and the New English Bible reflect, this is not reproach uttered by Christ against His people, but rather

> the reproach which belongs to Him who is the appointed envoy of God to a rebellious world. This reproach which was endured in the highest degree by Christ Jesus (Romans xv. 3) was endured also by those who in any degree prefigured or represented Him, those, that is, in whom He partially manifested and manifests Himself, those who live in Him and in whom He lives.[31]

---

[30]Eduard Schweizer, Lordship and Discipleship (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1960), p. 20.

[31]Westcott, p. 372. That the oneidismos Christou could be applied to Moses is explained by Moffatt, p. 180, as follows: "By identifying himself with God's people in Egypt, Moses encountered the same oneidismos

Not only had Christ Himself been the object of reproach (Rom. 15:3, Matt. 27:44, Mark 15:32,34), but He had also predicted that His disciples would be reviled and persecuted. It is significant that He can pronounce as blessed those who endure persecution for His sake: "Blessed are you when men revile you and persecute you and utter all kinds of evil against you falsely on my account. Rejoice and be glad, for your reward is great in heaven, for so men persecuted the prophets who were before you" (Matt. 5:11; compare Luke 6:22).

Thus the absence of shame in the face of persecution and in the presence of what is ordinarily shameful is frequently remarked. Paul, for example, could declare "I am not ashamed of the Gospel," Rom. 1:16, and these words were written in the full knowledge that his gospel was the message of a shameful cross, a stumbling block to Jews and folly to Greeks (1 Cor. 1:23). For the sake of that message Paul suffered much at many times. Writing to the Philippians from prison he expressed (1:20) his earnest expectation and hope "that I shall not be at all ashamed, but that with full courage now as always Christ will be honored in my body, whether by life or by death." At the end of his life, imprisoned once again and all but deserted by his companions, Paul could still say that he was not ashamed because he knew in whom he had believed and to whom he had devoted his life (2 Tim. 1:12).

And because Paul was fulfilling the sufferings of Christ, he can commend Onesiphorus for not being ashamed neither of testifying to the Lord nor to Paul His prisoner (2 Tim. 1:8). Rather, Timothy is to accept his share of the sufferings endured by all who follow and proclaim Christ.

---

as their very messiah afterwards was to endure. He thus faced what the writer, from his own standpoint, does not hesitate to call ton oneidismon tou Christou."

CHAPTER V

SHAME AND CHRISTIAN ETHICS

Shame and Sex

A close connection between shame and sex is frequently maintained. That the two are related is undeniable, but to assert that shame functions only, or even primarily, in the area of sex is misleading and incorrect. Both the Old Testament and the New Testament refuse to make an exclusive connection between the two.

The first mention of shame in the Bible is Gen. 2:25 where it is stated that in their pre-fall condition "the two of them were naked--both Adam and his wife--and they were not ashamed," kai ouk ēschynonto. This description is in obvious contrast with their actions following the events of Gen. 3:1-6. They then knew that they were naked, sewed fig leaves together to make aprons, and hid themselves from the God who had created them (3:8-11).

It has sometimes been averred that the very fact of the sexes is a result of the fall,[1] that there is by nature something shameful about

---

[1]This is a revival of the myth of the androgynes recounted by Aristophanes in Plato's Symposium, and taken up and reinterpreted by Sigmund Freud. William Graham Cole, Sex In Christianity And Psycho-Analysis (New York: Oxford University Press, 1955), p. 227, summarizes the legend as follows: "According to this myth, man was originally created double--two men, two women, and the man-woman androgynes. Zeus split them apart, and ever since the two halves have been striving to regain their original unity, a convenient explanation of sex and love whether heterosexual or homosexual."

nakedness,[2] or that there is something inherently shameful about the sex organs or the sex act.[3] These views are contradicted by the fact that in the Bible shame results not from sex itself, but from an aberration or perversion thereof. Cole furthermore correctly mentions sex as one of the three areas where Hebrew naturalism displays marked difference from Hellenistic dualism. We quote him at some length:

> Hellenism was strongly ascetic, regarding sex as at best a necessary evil and at worst slavery to the lower passions. The Old Testament, on the other hand, portrays God as commanding his creatures to be fruitful and multiply. Nowhere in its pages is there a counsel of celibacy or an exaltation of virginity. Jephthah's daughter mourns her virginal estate; the patriarchs and kings of Israel practice polygamy; the newlywed male is exempted by the Law from military service for one year so that he and his bride may enjoy the pleasures of wedded sexual life. The assumption throughout is that a man will marry and produce offspring, even taking concubines if necessary. The concern of the Hebrews for the continuation of their seed is one of the stronger motivations. The Law even provides for the so-called levirate marriage, wherein the childless widow of a man shall be bedded by his brother and the resultant child regarded as the offspring of the deceased. The only hint of asceticism of

---

[2]Saint Augustine, The City of God (New York: Modern Library, 1950), p. 466, says that "All nations, being propagated from that one stock, have so strong an instinct to cover the shameful parts, that some barbarians do not uncover them even in the bath, but wash with their drawers on." Although The Book of Jubilees 3:30-31 speaks disparagingly of the Gentile practice of uncovering themselves, it is obvious that the polemic is directed not so much against nakedness itself as against the entire process of Hellenization. The same is true of 1 Macc. 1:13-14 and 2 Macc. 4:12-14. A profounder interpretation of the fall is provided by Apocalypsis Mosis 20:1 and 23:1-2. Cole, p. 295, points out that "studies in child behavior coupled with reports on primitive tribes" indicate that there is no innate shame on the part of human beings in regard to nakedness.

[3]This is basically the position of St. Augustine, although care must be taken not to caricature his view. Of interest is his opinion in The City of God, pp. 474-75, that coitus in Paradise would have been accomplished without blushing. For Augustine's view generally, see Cole, pp. 43-65 and The City of God, pp. 464-76. Cole, pp. 11-12, admits that Clement of Alexandria came close to the extreme view that the original sin of Adam and Eve was the sexual act.

> any kind in Israel is to be found in the Nazarites and Rechabites, who represent a prophetic protest against the luxury and inequities of the commercial life of Canaan and a recall to the hardy simplicity and equality of nomadic existence. They are not dualists in any sense, and they represent a very minor strain in the Old Testament. There is a stern prohibition against adultery in the Law, but this springs from the concern for the seed, the family line. That this is not anti-sexual is demonstrated by the glaring absence of any ban on fornication, an omission which embarrassed later Christians of puritanical hue.[4]

The shame resulting from the fall, therefore, is but an evidence of what Gerhard von Rad calls the "inexplicable split in human nature" caused by the first sin.[5] Emil Brunner agrees; it is not, he says, "sexuality in itself which is the reason for their shame . . . but the nakedness unveiled by sin, which previously, like the terrible majesty of God, was veiled from them by God's loving Word which united them."[6]

There are indeed passages in the Old Testament where the genitals or pudenda[7] are referred to as aidoia or aischynē. Ezek. 23:20 describes the lovers of Oholibah--representing the unfaithfulness of Jerusalem--as having members (sarkes) like asses and genitals (aidoia) like those of horses. Aidoia is of course derived from the classical Greek word for honorable shame and its application to the sex organs is explained by Bultmann thus: "This has its basis in the fact that aidoia in the sexual sense are bearers of a deinon, but also in the fact that the fate which has overtaken one is a deinon which one is reluctant to display publicly.

---

[4]Cole, p. 11.

[5]Gerhard von Rad, Genesis (London: SCM Press, 1961), p. 83.

[6]Emil Brunner, Man in Revolt: A Christian Anthropology (London: Lutterworth Press, 1939), p. 350.

[7]From the Latin pudor, shame.

Kalyptesthai is frequently the symptom of aidōs."[8] No doubt the quality of the genitals which inspired awe in the mind of the ancient was their reproductive power. In spite of the context in which the passage stands, the application of the term to the organs of sex is in itself no sense derogatory.

The same allegory provides examples of the more usual description of the genitals as aischynē. It is stated that the Assyrians uncovered the shame of Oholah (23:10) and that Oholibah uncovered her own aischynē in the presence of the Chaldeans (23:18). Further examples which may be cited are Is. 47:2-3, Nah. 3:5, Ezek. 16:36-38, 22:10. It should be noted however that, with the exception of Ezek. 22:10, aischynē is never used of actual sexual sins. Rather it is always used figuratively, depicting either (a) The unfaithfulness or apostasy of Israel as the unfaithfulness of a wife to her husband, or (b) The destruction (uncovering) of those cities or nations which oppose God's will as the indignity of having one's private parts displayed publicly. In the case of Jerusalem there is the added irony that God exposes precisely those parts which have been employed in her unfaithfulness to God.

Only two New Testament passages may be adduced as linking shame particularly with sex or sexual sins--Rev. 3:14-22 and Rom. 1:18-32.

In the letter to Laodicea the recipients are counselled (Rev. 3:18) to buy white garments to keep the shame of their nakedness, aischynē tēs gymnotētos, from being seen. But their nakedness in no way refers to

---

[8]Rudolf Bultmann, "Aidōs," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel and translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), I, 169. Hereafter this work will be referred to as TDNT.

sins of sex, but rather to what Oepke terms a "nakedness of the soul."[9] The particular sins of the church at Laodicea, called by Ramsay "The City of Compromise,"[10] were spiritual lukewarmness and pride in physical prosperity. Furthermore, the location of Laodicea, although a wealthy commercial city, insures that sexual license which prevailed for example in Rome, Corinth and Ephesus would not be present. The mention of shame in this context is in contrast to the commercial life of the city. A great source of wealth lay in the glossy black wool produced by a highly developed breed of sheep from which woolen garments were made.[11] In spite of their physical prosperity, the Laodicean church stood before God in the nakedness of sin. The white garments which they are to wear--indicative of rejoicing in the righteousness of Christ (Rev. 7:9-17)--are in contrast to the color of the wool of the Laodicean sheep.

The use of the atimia root in Rom. 1:24, 26 also deserves attention. There it is stated that God has given man up to the dishonoring of their bodies, atimazesthai ta sōmata autōn; and again that God has given them up to dishonorable passions, eis pathe atimias. Paul goes on to describe the manner in which natural relations between men and women were exchanged for homosexual relations. The prominence given to sex and the perversion thereof requires explanation.

---

[9]Albrecht Oepke, "Gymnos, gymnotēs, gymnazō, gymnasia," TDNT, I, 775. Worthy of note is the fact that "naked" in the Apocalypse is always used in a figurative sense.

[10]William Ramsay, The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia and Their Place in the Apocalypse (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1909), pp. 413-33.

[11]Emil G. Kraeling, Rand McNally Bible Atlas (New York: Rand McNally and Co., 1956), p. 472.

Rome was not a remote provincial city like Laodicea, and one of the most prominent vices of the Roman populace was sexual license.[12] It would have been strange indeed had Paul not chosen to accentuate one of the most obvious vices of the time, sexual sins in general and homosexuality in particular. Leenhardt is likely correct in seeing here a reference also to the practice of sacred prostitution.[13]

The entire context of Rom. 1:18-32, however, indicates that there is no exclusive relationship between shame and sex. The subject with which Paul is dealing is idolatry and practical atheism. He describes the action and attitude and life of man who has exchanged the truth about God for a lie. Although the eternal power and deity is evident to man, he inexcusably worships the creature rather than the Creator by making images resembling mortal man or birds or animals.

The result of this fundamental alienation from God is a life characterized by sin of all types.[14] The dishonoring of the body by perversion of the sex instinct and the shameful passion of homosexuality are typical but not exhaustive examples. Rather, Paul appends an entire catalog of vices (verses 28 to 32) which characterize the life of the man alienated and separated from God. Although Paul does not attach the

---

[12]A typical testimony to the license and looseness of the period is Suetonius' description of the reign of Tiberius.

[13]Franz J. Leenhardt, The Epistle to the Romans (London: Lutterworth Press, 1961), p. 68. "Such prostitution associated with the cults which center on procreation show that man no longer realizes from whom he derives life and being, and to whom he is responsible for it."

[14]William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895), p. 45, point out the relationship between idolatry and other sins by saying that it is "automatic, one evil leading to another by natural sequence."

adjective "shameful" to these, it is evident that he considers any departure from God's law as shameful.

Shame and Sin

The Unregenerate Man

In 1 Cor. 1:18-31 Paul states that God chose the foolish and weak in the world in order to put to shame, hina kataischynē, the wise and the strong. The attitude of the wise and the strong as depicted in 1 Corinthians 1 corresponds with those who claimed to be wise but became fools in Romans 1. And the attitude of the strong man is certainly revealed in such vices as insolence, haughtiness, boastfulness which occur in the list of Rom. 1:29-31. There is furthermore a definite analogy between the threefold paredōken of Romans 1 and the threefold judgment of God in 1 Cor. 1:27-28.[15]

In what sense can we say that God puts to shame the wise and the strong? Morris states that it consists in the "contrast between the estimate the wise form of themselves and that which God's choice reveals."[16] Grosheide says that God "puts the world to shame by showing that it is mistaken even though it considers itself wise."[17] There seems, however, to be a much stronger element of judgment in the verb kataischynō, and

---

[15]The verb kataischynō is used twice, but is replaced by katargeō in the final clause of the triad (verse 28).

[16]Leon Morris, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians (London: Tyndale Press, 1958), p. 48.

[17]Frederik Willem Grosheide, Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1953), p. 51.

one wonders whether it does not indicate both God's displeasure in this age and the shame which the wise of this world will experience at the end of time.[18] Paul describes such people as "sons of disobedience" (Eph. 5:6), and their actions as "works of darkness" (5:11). It is shameful, aischros, even to speak of the things which they do in secret (5:12).

The attitude of the unregenerate man is not restricted to the pagan and heathen world, but is found also in the religious man who prides himself in the possession of God's law. Paul devotes a lengthy section of Romans (2:1-3:20) to proving that religious man (the Jew) is in the same position as the Gentile sinner, and that both alike have failed to attain righteousness before God. In 2:17-24 the apostle castigates the Jew because, in spite of his loyalty to and pride in the Law, he nevertheless transgresses those very commandments which he upholds. After asking a number of questions demonstrating the duplicity of the Jew in this respect, he summarizes his point by asking, "You who boast in the law, do you dishonor God, ton theon atimazeis, by breaking the law?"[19]

---

[18]The eschatological force which is frequently present in the use of kataischynō, infra, pp. 99-102.

[19]For the significance of the Law in the Old Testament and Judaism, see the first part of Bible Key Words (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), IV, T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus: Studies of its Form and Content (Cambridge: University Press, 1963), pp. 289-302, and Ernest de Witt Burton, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1921), pp. 443-59.

God, then, is dishonored or put to shame when man transgresses His Law.[20] How? First of all, because of the close relationship between God and His Law. As Murray says, "Transgression of the law is a dishonouring of God; it deprives him of the honour due to his name and offers insult to the majesty of which the law is the expression."[21] Secondly, the faithlessness of those who possess special knowledge of the Law provokes the Gentiles to blaspheme the name of God.

> The reasoning of the Gentiles is to the effect that a people are like their God and if the people can perpetrate such crimes their God must be of the same character and is to be execrated accordingly.[22]

The Enemies of the Gospel

The characteristics of unbridled license and false wisdom also apply to the enemies of the Gospel. The shame concept is used in connection with the opponents of true Christianity three times--Jude 13, Phil. 3:19 and 2 Cor. 4:2.[23]

---

[20]The Jewish aversion to idolatry is seen in the substitution of bosheth (shame) in names which had been compounded with baal, as e.g. from Eshbaal (1 Chron. 8:33) to Ishbosheth (2 Sam. 2:8), Meribbaal (2 Chron. 8:34) to Mephibasheth (2 Sam. 4:4), and Jerubbaal (Judg. 6:32) to Jerubbesheth (2 Sam. 11:21). A. E. Garvie, in his article "Shame," A Dictionary of the Bible Dealing with Its Language, Literature and Contents (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902), IV, 473, points out however that the original forms of the names "are not necessarily a proof of idolatry, as the name Baal may be used as a title of Jahweh."

[21]John Murray, The Epistle to the Romans (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1959), I, 84.

[22]Ibid.

[23]Whether a particular passage applies to unregenerate man or to religious opponents of the Gospel is sometimes difficult to determine. In the case of Jude 13 there is no question; at first glance the characteristics mentioned in Phil. 3:19 would scarcely seem applicable to the Judaizing opponents Paul deals with in that chapter, but the context compels a contrary decision; regarding 2 Cor. 4:2 Alfred Plummer, A

Jude utilizes a number of pictures to portray those who have secretly gained admission into the church and pervert the grace of God into licentiousness and deny the Lord Jesus (verse 4). They are, Jude says, blemishes on the love feasts of the Christians, waterless clouds, fruitless trees, wild waves of the sea, and wandering stars. The metaphor of especial interest to us is that of the wild waves of the sea foaming shameful deeds, epaphrizonta tas heautōn aischynas. The words are reminiscent of Is. 57:20: "The wicked are like the tossing sea; for it cannot rest, and its waters toss up mire and dirt." The sins of the wicked are referred to as "shames" and compared with either the flecks of foam that appear on the waves of a wild sea or with the bits of flotsam and mire flung up on the beach by the sea.

Phil. 3:19 shares with Jude 13 the description of shameful sins as open and obvious,[24] referring to "enemies of Christ" who glory in their shame, hē doxa en tē aischynē autōn. Martin sees in this reference at least a veiled allusion to the confidence of the Judaizers in circumcision,[25] and although Paul has spoken of circumcision in the same chapter (3:2-5), an allusion thereto at this point seems extremely unlikely. The complementary phrases which occur in conjunction with it--"whose God is their belly" and "who mind earthly things"--compel one to interpret the phrase

---

Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1915), p. 111, says that Paul "is not thinking of heathen vices, but of the underhanded methods of the false teachers."

[24]As opposed to Eph. 5:12 which speaks of things done in secret, and 2 Cor. 4:2 which refers to hidden things of shame.

[25]Ralph P. Martin, The Epistle of Paul to the Philippians (London: Tyndale Press, 1959), p. 158.

in a more general sense. As such it would indicate an impudent attitude which places undue emphasis on the pleasures of this life and neglects the deeper spiritual realities.

Describing the honest nature of his ministry in 2 Corinthians Paul remarks that "we have renounced the hidden things of shame," ta krypta tēs aischynēs, 4:2. Plummer affirms that the general sense is much the same however the expression is analyzed, but nonetheless mentions three possibilities: (1) The hidden things which bring disgrace when they are known; (2) the hidden things which make a man ashamed of himself, or (3) the hidden things which shame makes a man conceal.[26] While the exact meaning of the phrase is not entirely clear, the inference is certainly present that the opponents of Paul have not renounced the practices involved. Plummer considers the verb a timeless or ingressive aorist, and interprets hidden things of shame as practices which "are quite alien to the work of the Apostle."[27]

Shame and Repentance

The Attitude of a Christian Toward His Former Life

As Paul renounced deeds which were not in accord with his call, so also Christians generally forsake the shameful practices of their past lives. On numerous occasions the New Testament contrasts the former

---

[26]Plummer, p. 111. The English translations indicate no unanimity in their rendering of this verse.

[27]Ibid. Regarding the verb, Plummer observes that "apeipametha does not mean that he had previously practiced what he here says that he has renounced, as was the case with St. Matthew and Zaccheus as toll-collectors."

lives of Christians with their conversation as followers of Christ, and various pictures are employed to denote the change which takes place in the life of an individual when he commits himself to the Savior. The picture which Paul uses in Rom. 6:15-23 is that of slavery. The pre-Christian life of the Roman Christians is compared to slavery, with sin as the master. From that slavery the Christian has been set free to become a willing slave of God. Looking back upon the former life, Paul asks, "What return did you get from the things of which you are now ashamed, eph' hois nyn epaischynesthe (verse 21)?"[28] Answering his own question Paul designates death as the result of the former way and eternal life as the result of choosing God's way. Leenhardt says that "the believer who surveys his past recognizes that he has served a bad master under whose command he has done things of which he is now ashamed."[29]

Shame As a Motivation for Proper Conduct

Shame can also serve as a motivation to a repentance and as a prelude to right conduct. This is particularly true of the entropē root.

The use of entropē always indicates a certain optimism. When a person experiences this emotion he will recognize proper values and

---

[28]The verse may be punctuated in two ways: (1) "What return did you get from the things of which you are now ashamed?" with the implied answer being "None." (2) "What return did you have at that time?" with the answer "In the things of which you are now ashamed." Murray, p. 235 provides the reasons for preferring the former punctuation. Cf. also Sanday and Headlam, p. 169.

[29]Leenhardt, p. 174.

respect the social ties which bind him to others. In each of the five instances where the word is used in the Pauline corpus it is clear that reformation and change is expected.[30]

In 2 Thess. 3:14-15 Paul deals with the possibility that some may not obey what he has written. Should that occur, the erring brother is to be noted and avoided. The purpose of such treatment is that the brother will be brought to his senses. He is not to be considered an enemy, but to be warned as a brother in order that he may be ashamed, hina entrapē,[31] and as a result repent and return to the fold.

In 1 Cor. 4:14, after expostulating upon the persecution he himself has endured and ironically comparing himself in that respect with the Corinthians,[32] Paul avers that he is not writing such things to make them ashamed, ouk entrepōn hymas graphō tauta. While one suspects that this is precisely the reason Paul writes as he does, the apostle assumes instead a more personal approach, addressing them as his beloved children.

In both 1 Cor. 6:5 and 15:34 the phrase "I say this to your shame" occurs, pros entropēn hymin legō (lalō in the latter case). Paul is sufficiently aroused by errors existing in the Corinthian congregation--the taking of brother to pagan courts by brother in the first case (wrong conduct), and an ignorance regarding the resurrection in the second (wrong doctrine)--that he openly states that his words are designed

---

[30]Morris, p. 149.

[31]The translation of this passage and that of the identical phrase at Titus 2:8 must in English be very similar to that of 1 Peter 3:16. The use of kataischynō in the latter verse, however, does not exhibit the optimism of entropē.

[32]Cf. the use of the atimia root in the same context, verse 10.

to cause shame. His words are intended "to lay bare existing evil,"[33] and there is no question that Paul expects the situation to change immediately. The seriousness with which Paul viewed the situation in both cases is very evident.[34]

And in Titus 2:8 Paul envisages a situation where an opponent, ho ex enantias,[35] may speak against the Christian pastor. For that reason Titus is to regulate his life in such a way that every prospective opponent will find nothing evil to say, and thus be put to shame, hina entrapē.

Further examples of the tactful manner in which St. Paul employed the idea of shame in his dealings with the troublesome congregation at Corinth are 2 Cor. 7:14, 10:8, and 11:21. A treatment of his usage of shame at 2 Cor. 9:4 is reserved for the concluding chapter.

Shame as a Christian Virtue

In the Jewish wisdom literature two emphases regarding shame may be observed. Although neither is given overt expression in the New Testament, we shall consider them briefly in order to provide background for the discussion of shame as a Christian virtue.

---

[33]Grosheide, p. 136.

[34]The situation Paul had dealt with in Chapters 1-4 is not less serious. The difference lies that in the one case Paul is making a personal appeal, as a father to his spiritual children; in the other two he employs his apostolic authority.

[35]The context would seem to suggest that Paul means an opposing faction or individual within the church, although Walter Lock, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Pastoral Epistles (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1924), p. 142, says that "doubtless the main thought is of pagan criticism." Rather it seems that the author is enunciating a general principle of pastoral decorum.

The first emphasis is that the wise, prudent, or godly man avoids shame.[36] He is careful to avoid situations or acts which may bring shame upon himself, his family, or his ancestors; and at the same time he avoids whenever possible doing anything which might cause shame in others, regardless of their status or position. A few quotations from Proverbs and Sirach--all employing the atimia complex--adequately illustrate this double avoidance of shame by the godly man:

"When pride comes, then comes disgrace (Prov. 11:2)."

"A companion of gluttons shames his father (Prov. 28:7)."

"It is ill-mannered for a man to listen at a door,
and a discreet man is grieved by the disgrace (Sirach 21:24)."

"It is a disgrace to be the father of an undisciplined son,
and the birth of a daughter is a loss.
A sensible daughter obtains her husband,
but one who acts shamefully brings grief to her father.
An impudent daughter disgraces father and husband,
and will be despised by both (Sirach 22:3-5)."

"Glory and dishonor come from speaking,
and a man's tongue is his downfall (Sirach 5:13)."

---

[36]The emphasis is not absent from classical Greek literature; cf. the note supra, p. 8, concerning Aristotle's view of shame. There is a similarity also to what sociologists in the Philippines label SIR (Smooth Interpersonal Relations). Frank Lynch, "Social Acceptance," Social Foundations of Community Development: Readings on the Philippines, edited by Socorro C. Espiritu and Chester L. Hunt (Manila: R. M. Garcia Publishing House, 1964), p. 324, maintains that there is a clear intercultural difference on this point between Filipinos and Americans. He defines SIR as "a facility at getting along with others in such a way as to avoid outward signs of conflict. . . . It means being agreeable, even under difficult circumstances, and of keeping quiet or out of sight when discretion passes the word. It means a sensitivity to what other people feel at any given moment, and a willingness and ability to change tack (if not direction) to catch the lightest favoring breeze." A Filipino acquires and preserves SIR, according to Lynch, principally by three means: (1) Pakikisama, a Tagalog word denoting a willingness to follow the lead or suggestion of another, concession, or "good public relations"; (2) euphemism; and (3) the use of go-betweens.

The last quotation introduces the second emphasis of the wisdom literature--namely the relative nature of shame. The use of the tongue in itself is not shameful nor praiseworthy. The manner in which and the purpose for which it is used determines its propriety or impropriety, thus bestowing on the speaker glory, doxa, or dishonor, atimia.

The most illustrative passage is Sirach 41:16b-42:8, which we quote in full:

> For it is not good to retain every kind of shame,
> and not everything is confidently esteemed by every one.
> Be ashamed of immorality, before your father or mother;
> and of a lie, before a prince or a ruler;
> of a transgression, before a judge or magistrate;
> and of iniquity, before a congregation or the people;
> of unjust dealing, before your partner or friend;
> and of theft, in the place where you live.
> Be ashamed before the truth of God and his covenant.
> Be ashamed of selfish behavior at meals,
> of surliness in receiving and giving,
> and of silence, before those who greet you;
> of looking at a woman who is a harlot,
> and of rejecting the appeal of a kinsman;
> of taking away some one's portion or gift,
> and of gazing at another man's wife;
> of meddling with his maidservant--
> and do not approach her bed;
> of abusive words, before friends--
> and do not upbraid after making a gift;
> of repeating and telling what you hear,
> and of revealing secrets.
> Then you will show proper shame,
> and will find favor with every man.
>
> Of the following things do not be ashamed,
> and do not let partiality lead you to sin:
> of the law of the Most High and his covenant,
> and of rendering judgment to acquit the ungodly;
> of keeping accounts with a partner or with traveling companions,
> and of dividing the inheritance of friends;
> of accuracy with scales and weights,
> and of acquiring much or little;
> of profit from dealing with merchants,
> and of much discipline of children,
> and of whipping a wicked servant severely.
> Where there is an evil wife, a seal is a good thing;
> and where there are many hands, lock things up.
> Whatever you deal out, let it be by number and weight,

and make a record of all that you give out or take in.
Do not be ashamed to instruct the stupid or foolish
or the aged man who quarrels with the young.
Then you will be truly instructed,
and will be approved before all men.

Here it is seen that to be ashamed or not to be ashamed in itself is neither virtuous nor reprehensible. There is a proper and an improper shame, depending upon the person, act or situation which causes or fails to cause it. The determining factor is the standards, principles, and rules of the society and group to which one belongs. These standards differ from one group to another, and consequently what is shameful in one society may meet with approbation in another.

In the New Testament, shame never achieves the status of a positive Christian virtue.[37] As mentioned above,[38] the absence of shame is remarked more frequently than the presence thereof. Although Christian exhortation ingeniously takes over from the ethics of popular philosophy and morality certain concepts and patterns of arrangement,[39] aidos occurs

---

[37]Even in a shame-culture, the question arises, "Is hiya (shame) a virtue or a vice?" In answer to that question Father Jaime Bulatao, "Hiya," Philippine Studies, XII (July, 1964), 437, answers, "There is a beauty about hiya, something like its namesake the sensitive mahiyain plant, which when touched closes itself. Perhaps the answer is to say that it is a virtue, but that too much of it makes it a vice. But what is too much? In a static culture hiya makes for peace and order, for the maintenance of tradition, for the support of the existing order of authority. In a changing culture, an equal degree of hiya in a nation may hinder social progress, by hindering communication, by imposing conformity with tradition, by inhibiting entrepreneurship."

[38]Supra, pp. 23-24.

[39]Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955), II, 226.

but twice: at Heb. 12:28, a questionable variant reading; and at 1 Tim. 2:9, where it is linked with sōphrosynē.[40] Entrope never really assumes a prominent role.

Rudolf Bultmann explains the disappearance of aidos as a Christian virtue by saying that not only had it become a highbrow term, but also it had come to be used primarily of an hexis. "The essence of the believer," he continues

> is not a relationship to himself, a hexis or aretē, but a being before God and towards his neighbour. To the extent that aidos does, of course, include an attitude of respect and reserve towards others, this is very different from the Christian being towards the other. For the latter does not rest on a conception of the polis or kosmos, but on the claim of the other as a neighbour. Hence the term aidos is robbed of its fundamental significance; aidēmōn is replaced by pisteuōn and agapōn.[41]

---

[40]Commenting on this passage in his Synonyms of the New Testament (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Truebner and Co. Ltd., 1915), pp. 67-68, Richard C. Trench distinguishes between the two words by affirming that aidos is "that 'shamefastness,' or pudency, which shrinks from overpassing the limits of womanly reserve and modesty, as well as from the dishonour which would justly attach thereto," while sōphrosynē is "that habitual inner self-government, with its constant rein on all the passions and desires, which would hinder the temptation to this from arising, or at all events from arising in such strength as should overbear the checks and barriers which aidōs opposed to it."

[41]Bultmann, Aidōs, I, 171.

CHAPTER VI

SHAME AND CHRISTIAN ESCHATOLOGY

In Relation To The Old Testament

The concept of shame figures promenently in a double development within Old Testament eschatology.

The one development resulted in the fusing of the separate eschatologies of the individual and of the nation: "The righteous individual, no less than the righteous nation, will participate in the Messianic Kingdom, for the righteous dead of Israel will rise to share therein."[1] The synthesizing factor in this development--which found its completion in the apocalyptic literature of Judaism--was the doctrine of the resurrection.[2] An illustrative passage is Dan. 12:2-3:

> And many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt (eis oneidismon kai eis aischynon aionion). And those who are wise shall shine like the brightness of the firmament; and those who turn many to righteousness, like the stars for ever and ever.[3]

---

[1]R. H. Charles, Eschatology: The Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, Judaism, and Christianity (New York: Schocken Books, 1963), p. 130.

[2]Cf. Robert Martin-Achard, From Death to Life: A Study of the Development of the Doctrine of the Resurrection in the Old Testament (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1960). The doctrine of a resurrection was in itself a late development within Judaism, and as Gerhard von Rad, Old Testament Theology (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), II, 350, says, is found in the Old Testament "only peripherally."

[3]On the significance of this passage in the development of a doctrine of the resurrection see the remarks of Arthur Jeffery, The Interpreter's Bible (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), VI, 542. See also Martin-Achard, pp. 138-46, and Charles, pp. 131-42. Cf. 1 Cor. 15:35 where the resurrection body is contrasted with the earthly body in terms of glory and dishonor.

The second development is the recognition that the day of the Lord was to be a judgment not only upon the national enemies of Israel, but rather the day in which He manifests Himself "for the vindication of Himself and of His righteous purposes, and not of Israel."[4] This reinterpretation of an already-existing concept began with the prophets of the eighth century and assumed various forms, depending upon historical circumstances, in the prophecies of the next three centuries.[5]

The prophet Amos is the most eloquent spokesman of this reinterpretation. The nations surrounding Israel shall be punished for their many sins (1:2-2:5), but Israel shall receive special attention on the day of reckoning because of the special relationship God had established with her (2:6-16). "You only have I known," says the Lord, "of all the families of the earth; therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities (3:2)." And upon the Israelite who looks for the day of the Lord as a vindication of his wickedness, Amos pronounces the following woe (5:18-20):

> Woe to you who desire the day of the Lord! Why would you have the day of the Lord? It is darkness, and not light; as if a man fled from a lion, and a bear met him; or went into the house and leaned with his hand against the wall, and a serpent bit him. Is not the day of the Lord darkness, and not light, and gloom with no brightness in it?

The judgment of God upon the nations and upon his chosen people is frequently pictured as a putting to shame.[6] The chief sin of the nations

---

[4]Charles, p. 88.

[5]G. Ernest Wright, "The Faith of Israel," The Interpreter's Bible, I, 372.

[6]Correspondingly, the bestowal of God's favor and grace is frequently pictured as the removal of shame or disgrace imposed by a personal adversary or an ungodly nation.

was "that of inordinate ambition and self-deifying pride which their power, wealth, and idolatry made possible"; that of Judah and Israel was "rebellion against the God who had chosen them and bound them to himself."[7] In opposition to the wealth, honor and pride of Tyre,[8] for example, God intends "to defile the pride of all glory, to dishonor, atimasai, all the honored of the earth (Is. 23:9)." The Lord has also stretched out His hand and destroyed Jerusalem, who had rejected Him and kept going backward (Jer. 15:5-9). The description of the destruction wrought upon the city is concluded with the declaration (verse 9) that "she has been shamed and disgraced," katēschynthē kai oneidisthē. And to the prophet or priest who perverts the word of the Lord is promised "everlasting reproach and perpetual shame, which shall not be forgotten (Jer. 23:40)." These passages are but typical of many in the Old Testament which depict the punishment and judgment of the Lord in terms of shame.

The New Testament usage of the same concept in an eschatological setting differs from that of the Old Testament in two ways. First of all, the writers of the New Testament employ the idea of shame with neither the frequency nor the fervor of the Old Testament prophets.[9] Secondly, while the Old Testament writers employ shame almost exclusively

---

[7]Wright, I, 372.

[8]The pride and activity of the Tyrians, who sit in the seat of the gods and in the heart of the seas, saying "I am a god," is movingly described in Ezekiel 28.

[9]This does not mean that the Old Testament community was more eschatology-oriented than the New Testament community. It rather indicates that the New Testament writers use the idea of shame less frequently in eschatological settings.

as a picture of God's judgment upon the ungodly, the corresponding New Testament passages are rather designed to encourage faithfulness and loyalty to Christ and His cause.

Only two passages--Mark 8:38 with its parallels, and 1 John 2:28--require careful attention. In addition, the eschatological force which frequently adheres to the use of kataischynō shall be remarked.

Mark 8:38

"Whoever is ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him will the Son of man also be ashamed, when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." This logion--a clear prediction of the final eschatological coming of Christ[10]--appears in the Synoptic gospels in both a Markan form and a Q form. The Markan form also occurs at Luke 9:26, but is omitted by Matthew who in the same context merely states that the Son of Man in his glory "will repay every man for what he has done (16:27)." The Q form, not containing an explicit reference to shame, is found at Luke 12:8-9 and Matt. 10:32-33.[11] The Lukan reference reads as follows: "I tell you, every one who acknowledges me before men, the Son of man also will acknowledge before the angels of God; but he who denies me before men will be denied before the angels of God."

---

[10]Archibald Thomas Robertson, Word Pictures in the New Testament (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1930), I, 337.

[11]T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus: Studies of Its Form and Content (Cambridge: University Press, 1931), p. 263, considers the Q form the more primitive, owing to its greater completeness and the fact that it preserves best the poetical form and strict parallelism.

Before addressing ourselves to the significance of the passages, certain observations concerning the text are in order.

1. The context of the Markan form of the saying is the same in both Mark and Luke where, following the confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi, Jesus utters the first passion prediction. Then follows a composite group of sayings addressed to the disciples and the crowd (Mark 8:34-9:1; Luke 9:23-27; compare Matt. 16:24-28) dealing with the taking up of one's cross, the worth of one's soul, and the coming of the Kingdom in power. The logion under discussion is found in the midst of this section. The variants which occur between Mark and Luke are quite insignificant, the third evangelist omitting Mark's "in this adulterous and sinful generation" and slightly changing the description of the glory in which the Son of Man is to come.

2. The immediate context of the Q form is similar in Matthew and Luke, but the larger context differs. In both cases Jesus is addressing the disciples and the saying is immediately preceded by sayings concerning their greater worth than sparrows and the numbering of the hairs of their heads. The Matthaean version is found, however, in His instructions previous to the sending out of the twelve, much earlier than the Lukan version, which is found in the midst of the so-called "travel narrative." The variants between the two are slight, in most cases reflecting only the personal predilection of the evangelist.[12]

---

[12]The "I" of Matt. 10:32-33 identifies Luke's third person "Son of Man" as Jesus; Matthew has "before My Father in heaven" for Luke's "before the angels of God." In addition the verb forms differ slightly to correspond with the person of the noun.

Assuming with T. W. Manson that the confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi is the turning-point of the synoptic chronology,[13] the point at which the group of sayings in Mark 8:34-9:1 occur is significant.[14] Following Peter's confession three new elements become apparent in Jesus' teaching, all three of which are found in the last part of Mark 8. They are:

1. The conviction that Jesus Himself must go to Jerusalem to suffer, die and be raised. This conviction is shown by the passion predictions which occur in Mark at regular intervals (8:31, 9:31 and 10:33-34).[15]

2. An emphasis upon a cosmic event characterized by the appearance of the Kingdom of God and the Son of Man as judge (8:38, 9:1).

3. An appeal for loyalty to His own person and an exhortation to fearless confession on His behalf (8:34-38).

The saying we are studying, therefore, occurred at a crucial moment in the ministry of Jesus, a moment when a new conviction became evident in the mind of Jesus and a new element entered His preaching.[16]

Turning to the saying of Mark 8:38 itself, we note the inference that Jesus was the type of individual of whom people might well be ashamed. The records of all four gospels testify not only to the

---

[13]Manson, p. 13.

[14]No such significance attaches to the position of the Q form of the saying. Matthew places it before Caesarea Philippi, Luke thereafter.

[15]The regularity of the passion predictions in Mark is broken in Luke by the insertion of the travel narrative (9:51-18:14), and overshadowed in Matthew by the five-part outline of the evangelist.

[16]Cf. especially Albert Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus (New York: Macmillan Co., 1964), p. 388.

austere manner of His personal life and the opposition which His acts and message provoked in official circles, but also to the fact that the populace as a whole rejected Him. The crowning indignity was betrayal, denial, and desertion by His own disciples. "It is an essential element in that Messianic veiledness . . . that the Son of Man in this age be one of whom men will often be tempted to be ashamed."[17]

The point of the entire saying in its various forms is that "the lot of the individual on the Great Day depends strictly on his attitude to Jesus in the intervening period."[18] Whether one will stand among the sheep or the goats, at the right or left of the Son of Man on the great day of judgment (Matt. 25:31-46)--depends upon where one stands in his earthly life. The attitude of the heavenly Son of Man toward an individual is determined by the individual's reaction to the earthly Son of Man. Shame will be rewarded with shame, confession with confession, denial with denial.

The element of personal loyalty to Jesus comes out particularly strong in this saying. The thing which is envisioned as causing shame in a person[19] is Jesus Himself, or His words, or His people.[20] Heinrich Schlier describes such shame as an

---

[17]C. E. B. Cranfield, The Gospel According to Saint Mark (Cambridge: University Press, 1963), p. 283.

[18]Manson, p. 263.

[19]Alfred Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1896), p. 249, hints that this receives emphasis in the compound verb epaischynomai. "The epi in comp.," he says, "means 'on account of'; this is the ground of his shame."

[20]Certain manuscripts omit the word logous in both Mark and Luke, thus placing the emphasis rather on the followers of Jesus. The omission has been defended especially by Manson, p. 332, who incidentally finds support in the omission for his collective interpretation of the Son of Man.

> anxiety born of doubt as to the truth of the Lord, lest the judgment of the world in which we live will be one of contempt. Being ashamed of the Lord in this way, and seeking honour from the world rather than from Him, we bring the Lord Himself into contempt.[21]

The existence of shame--or the absence thereof--may be exhibited either actively or passively. Passively, it betokens an instinctive shrinking from that of which we are ashamed, a refusal to identify ourselves therewith, and an unwillingness to exert ourselves on its behalf. As examples we might mention the act of hiding one's face[22] (compare Is. 53:3; Ps. 22:24, 69:17), the denial of Peter in the high-priest's courtyard, and the unconcern toward suffering and poverty of those described in Matt. 25:41-46.

Actively, shame towards an object assumes a shamelessness which attempts to bring that object to a bad end, which attempts to make the person appear stupid or ridiculous, and which rejoices in discomfort or suffering. Biblical examples that might be cited are those of Judas, the action of the enemies of the Psalmist in Psalms 22 and 69, and the persistent attempt of the Scribes and Pharisees to discredit our Lord.

The reaction of the Son of Man in judgment exhibits a corresponding active and passive aspect. On the one hand it means a denial of acquaintance and a refusal to recognize (Matt. 25:12); on the other it signifies an accusation of unfaithfulness and disloyalty, as well as consignment to punishment (Matt. 25:41-46).

---

[21]Heinrich Schlier, "Arneomai," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel and translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), I, 470. Hereafter this work will be referred to as TDNT.

[22]Infra, pp. 119-21.

The two verbs which occur in the Q form of our saying (homologeō and arneomai)--one in contrast with shame, the other closely allied with it--exhibit the same double aspect. They also bring to our attention another significant feature of the New Testament shame concept already touched upon,[23] namely that shame is frequently caused by or evidenced in the spoken word. Attention may be drawn to an instance where they are used together--John 1:20. When the priests and Levites questioned John the Baptist, it is stated that "He confessed, he did not deny," and the following (1:20-35) gives content to both words. The fact that he did not exalt himself nor grasp for honors not belonging to him, and the fact that he bore positive witness to Jesus mark John as one who was not ashamed of the Son of Man. Both words, as well as the use of "to witness," martureo in verse 32, carry with them the idea of truthfulness and testifying to the actual state of affairs.

Schlier stresses that in the New Testament the use of arneomai implies a previous relationship of obedience and fidelity, and that the word "receives its emphasis from the fact that the object whose claim is resisted and denied is in the NT supremely a person"--Jesus Christ.[24] Because they shed light on what it means to "be ashamed of Christ," the three forms which, according to Schlier, denying Him may take are here summarized:

1. A failure to meet concretely the claim of Jesus Christ for a confession of discipleship.

2. A failure to do justice to the claims of one's neighbors. In this sense, any unethical conduct may be described as a denial of Christ.

---

[23]Supra, p. 20.

[24]Schlier, p. 469.

3. The failure to acknowledge Jesus Christ in sound doctrine.[25]

In Mark 8:38 and parallels severity of judgment is not particularly at issue. Rather, Jesus is giving expression to a "solemn, sobering, inevitable law"[26] operative in God's kingdom.

1 John 2:28

Many of the emphases in Mark 8:38 are also present in 1 John 2:28, which reads: "And now, little children, abide in him, so that when he appears we may have confidence and not shrink from him in shame (mē aischynthōmen) at his coming." As in Mark 8:38 we see (1) a definite reference to the second coming of Christ; (2) an emphasis upon the necessity of loyalty and faithfulness to Christ; and (3) a word, parrēsia, which is helpful in further illuminating the shame-concept in connection with Christian eschatology. We shall consider these three in turn.

1. The return of Christ in judgment is referred to as His "appearance" and His "coming."

Phaneroun is one of the favorite words in the Johannine writings, and occurs with marked frequency especially in the first epistle.[27] A. E. Brooke observes that it is used of all the manifestations of the Lord, "in the flesh, after the Resurrection, at the Second Coming," and

---

[25] Ibid., p. 470.

[26] A. H. McNeile, The Gospel According to St. Matthew (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1961), p. 147.

[27] A. E. Brooke, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Johannine Epistles (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912), p. 82 states that the word occurs in 1 John eighteen times, and in twelve Christ is the subject.

provides examples for each.[28] In the section 2:28-3:8 the verb occurs five times, twice referring to His appearance in the flesh to remove sin (3:5) and destroy the works of the devil (3:8), and once in contemplation of the future estate of the sons of God (3:2). In 2:28 and 3:2 it is used in reference to the final appearance of Christ, although the latter verse is grammatically subject to another interpretation.[29] The double insistence in the immediately preceding section that it is the last hour (2:18) serves to heighten and emphasize the eschatological expectancy which characterizes the New Testament community.

Although it became a technical term for the second coming of Christ,[30] the word parousia occurs in Johannine literature only in the passage under discussion. Like epiphania, it was a usual expression denoting the visit of a king or emperor, and thus appropriated by Christians and used in referring to the expected arrival of their King. There seems to be the added significance that such terms were used as a means of protesting the popular imperial worship.[31]

---

[28] Ibid., p. 65.

[29] On the interpretation of the phrase ean phanerōthē in 3:2 the translations are divided. Phillips and the NEB refer it to "when it (namely, what we shall be) is disclosed"; KJV and RSV both make Christ the subject, "when He shall appear." To the present writer the general sense of the passage and the presence of the identical phrase in 2:28 make the latter view preferable. The comments of Brooke, p. 82, are of interest.

[30] Cf. for example Matt. 24:3,27,37,39; 1 Thess. 2:19, 3:13, 4:15, 5:23, etc.

[31] Cf. F. F. Bruce, The Apostolic Defence of the Gospel (London: Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1959), pp. 54-57.

2. Those who are ashamed of the Son of Man are in 1 John denoted as antichrists, whose very presence indicates[32] that the curtain is already rising upon the final eschatological drama (2:18-23). These had separated themselves from the Christian community and, in denying that Jesus is the Christ, thereby deny both the Father and the Son (compare 4:3).[33]

In opposition to and in contrast with such a shameful denial of Christ, the recipients of 1 John are exhorted to remain in Christ. Again a favorite Johannine word, menō, is used and the typical Johannine method of repetition is employed. "Remain in Him," (2:27-28)[34] recalls the entire picture of the vine and the branches (John 15:1-17) where the same verb prominently occurs. The writer would have them "continue in that which they have. And their greatest possession is their personal fellowship with their Master. The Strength of the Society lies in the personal relationship of the members to the Head."[35] The basic thought of the passage, therefore, is that in the day of judgment the godly will exhibit boldness and confidence rather than shame in God's presence, while the sinful man will be ashamed to stand before Him.

---

[32]Note the hothen in verse 18; cf. the use of prōton and tote in 2 Thess. 2:3 and 2:8.

[33]The presence of both arneomai and homologeo in 2:22-23 should be noted in connection with the usage of the same verbs in the Q form of Mark 8:38.

[34]The Greek phrase is the same in both verses. The context seems to demand, however, an indicative force in verse 27, contrasting with the opposite (cf. 2:19) behavior of the opponents; an imperative force seems rather indicated for its repetition in the following verse.

[35]Brooke, p. 64.

3. The phrases "we may have boldness" and "we might not be ashamed" are in apposition to one another. We shall attempt to give further content to the latter by examining the former.

The Johannine writings account for thirteen of thirty-one occurrences of parrēsia in the New Testament. Seven of nine occurrences of the verbal form parresiazomai are found in Acts, where it always denotes the fearless testimony given by the apostles.

Derived etymologically from pas and rēma the noun has the basic meaning of freedom or boldness of speech. Moses Hadas, for example, refers to the eleutheria, "freedom," and parrēsia exhibited in the fact that the comedies of Aristophanes were produced in Athens at a time when the city was at war, even though the leading officials or the community were being ridiculed.[36] The word soon acquired the more general idea of confidence or courage, especially in the presence of persons of high rank.[37]

There is a sharp difference in the Johannine usage of parrēsia between the gospel and the first epistle. The nine occurrences in the gospel refer to doing or saying something openly or plainly. After initially referring to Lazarus' death as a sleep, for example, Jesus later informs his disciples parrēsia that he has died (John 11:14). The four occurrences in the epistle, on the other hand, refer either to the confidence exhibited in prayer to God (3:21, 5:14) or to the boldness of

---

[36]The Complete Plays of Aristophanes, edited and with an introduction by Moses Hadas (New York: Bantam Books, 1962), p. 9.

[37]William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 635.

the Christians on the day of judgment (2:28, 4:17). A strong eschatological note is likewise sounded in 4:17, which refers to "the day of judgment," but phobos, fear, rather than shame is placed in opposition to parrēsia.

The Eschatological Force of Kataischynō

Of the fourteen times that the verb kataischynō appears in the New Testament, a number of instances seem to reflect or to impart to the passage in question an eschatological emphasis. Here we see a continuation of the Septuagint's fondness for employing the aischynē root in connection with God's judgment against human pride. As a result of that judgment the ungodly are put to shame, and those who trust in God are not put to shame.[38]

The passages, for example, where Is. 28:16 is quoted[39]--stating that those who believe in Christ will not be put to shame--certainly indicate more than the disillusion and disappointment which the non-Christian experiences during this present evil age. Rather it foresees the ultimate judgment to be pronounced upon those who pursue a righteousness based on law (Rom. 9:31-32), who stumble because they disobey the word as they were destined to do (1 Peter 2:8). On the other hand, those whose hearts believe in Jesus and whose lips confess His name will escape such judgment and will be saved (Rom. 10:9-14).[40] Whatever the

---

[38]Rudolf Bultmann, "Aischynē," TDNT, I, 189.

[39]Rom. 9:33, 10:11 and 1 Peter 2:6. These passages have already been dealt with at some length, supra, pp. 40-44.

[40]The eschatological note is heightened not only by the future tense "will be saved," but also by the quotation at 10:13 from Joel 2:32, which deals with the great day of the Lord when the ultimate purposes of God will be revealed.

precise meaning of the Hebrew text of Is. 28:16, the use of kataischynō shows that both the Septuagint translators and the New Testament authors interpret the passage as referring to the judgment of shame which God's people will escape at the last day.

A similar emphasis upon a future salvation is found in the context of Rom. 5:5, which states that the Christian hope ou kataischynei, "maketh not ashamed (KJV)."[41] The eschatological orientation of the passage is heightened by the reference in verse two to the hope of sharing God's glory;[42] also by the reference in verse nine of a future salvation from the wrath of God. In this section the apostle is drawing attention to the tension between what one is now and what he hopes to become, between the present condition of the believer and his future existence.[43] In spite of the shame which results in this time from suffering for Christ, there will be an ultimate vindication of the believer, which is described as an absence of shame, a sharing in God's glory and the escape from His wrath. The opposite aspect--namely the shaming of the unbeliever--is clearly stressed in 1 Cor. 1:27. There it is said that God has chosen the foolish and the weak of the world in order to shame, hina kataischynē, and to bring to nothing the wise and the strong.

---

[41]The statement might be paraphrased, "Hope does not result in a judgment which causes shame." The modern translations make no explicit mention of shame, speaking rather of the hope which does not disappoint (RSV, Phillips, TEV) and which is no mockery (NEB).

[42]Sanday and Headlam, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1955), p. 121, for example, say that this is "the Glory of the Divine Presence (Shekinah) communicated to man (partially here, but) in full measure when he enters into that Presence; man's whole being will be transfigured by it."

[43]Cf. Franz J. Leenhardt, The Epistle to the Romans (London: Lutterworth Press, 1961), p. 133.

In our treatment of the parable of the chief seats it was pointed out that the words of Jesus enunciate a fundamental principle of God's rule over men. Although the eschatological tone is subdued in Luke 14:7-11, it comes out more clearly in the version which in some manuscripts follows Matt. 20:28.[44] Two factors serve to emphasize the eschatological: the context in which the saying is placed[45] and the variant manner in which the shame concept is expressed. (1) The Lukan version is addressed to guests of a ruler of the Pharisees in whose house Jesus was dining. In the Matthaean interpolation Jesus is reprimanding unworthy behavior and attitudes on the part of His disciples; namely, the self-assertion of the sons of Zebedee and the subsequent indignation of the other disciples. The emphasis upon the expected Kingdom of Christ and the thrones upon which the mother of Zebedee's children envisioned her sons as sitting imparts an unmistakable eschatological tone to the incident. The entire reply of Jesus, further, emphasizes the same truth expressed in Mark 8:38, that one's place in the Kingdom is determined by his loyalty and faithfulness during the present age. (2) The proud guest in Luke's narrative begins to take

---

[44]Estimates of the interpolation differ. B. H. Streeter, The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1961), pp. 241-42, remarks the paucity of verbal agreements between the two versions and concludes that the Matthaean version is drawn from a tradition independent of Luke. Joachim Jeremias, Unknown Sayings of Jesus (London: SPCK, 1964), p. 39, on the other hand considers it "no more than an inferior variation on Luke 14.8-10, with an introduction which at first looks meaningless, but which is really only clumsily expressed."

[45]T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus (London: SCM Press, 1949), pp. 278-79, states that its interpolation "just there (after Matt. 20:28) is itself evidence that the parable was rightly understood in the early days of the Church."

the lowest place with shame, meta aischynēs; the unworthy disciple in Matthew's account is put to shame (compare kataischynthēsē) by the words and action of the host. The second aspect of shame previously remarked[46] in connection with the Lucan version--namely that the shame is experienced in the presence of others--is notably absent from Matthew's account. Rather the focus of attention is upon the judgmental action of the host. The eschatological motif is heightened not only by the use of kataischynō, but also by the precise point at which the shame concept occurs,[47] and also in the fact that Matthew makes no express reference to other guests.[48]

---

[46]Supra, p. 59.

[47]In Matthew the phrase, "You will be put to shame," follows immediately upon the words of the host, "Go still lower down." In Luke, on the other hand, the presence of shame is more intimately connected with the act of taking a lower seat in the presence of others.

[48]Matthew omits Luke's mention of "all those who sit at the table with you," verse 10.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Eastern or Western?

A distinction was drawn in the introductory chapter between an eastern and a western view of shame. In the first shame is a dominating social sanction, determining and regulating the behavior and relationships of a person; in the other shame is merely a secondary concept of a more psychological or personal nature.

The characteristics of the New Testament view of shame are in closer agreement with the eastern view. The remainder of this concluding chapter shall attempt to delineate more clearly the accents and emphases of shame in the New Testament which agree with the eastern view. Before proceeding to that task, however, two significant divergences should be noted.

1. Nowhere in biblical literature does shame assume the importance as a dominating and regulating influence which it possesses in contemporary shame-cultures. Even when--as in the heroic Greek period--it is viewed as a positive force affecting the acts and attitudes of the virtuous person, one cannot escape the impression that shame is merely <u>one</u> determining influence among many rather than <u>the</u> principle which determines and regulates what a person does in almost every situation.[1]

---

[1]Jaime Bulatao, "<u>Hiya</u>," <u>Philippine Studies</u> XII (July 1964), 437, for example, speaks of shame in the Filipino setting as a unifying principle which, if suddenly removed, would "leave only chaos in its place." The writings of the New Testament do not convey the impression that the early Christian community would have been similarly affected.

This conclusion is supported by the relative infrequency with which the shame concept appears in the Gospels. Precisely in the description of the day-to-day activities of our Lord and especially in the parables He told[2] one would expect the shame concept to be most prominent. Precisely there the shame concept is remarkably infrequent. There are indeed incidents where shame is implied--the denial by Peter and his subsequent repentance is a good example[3]--but the absence of any specific reference thereto serves to accentuate its relative non-importance for New Testament thought. Unchristian or sub-Christian behavior, it should be noted, is attributed not to an absence of shame but to a lack of faith or love.

2. Although the absence of shame is frequently remarked both in a shame-culture and also in the New Testament, there is nonetheless a basic and significant difference. The early Greek anaideia and the Filipino walang hiya both savor of rudeness, arrogance, insolence and disregard for others. In sharp contrast the absence of shame in the New Testament is usually[4] a testimony to one's loyalty and faithfulness

---

[2]Regarding the parables, for example, Guenther Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1960), p. 69, says "They make use of the familiar world, a comprehensible world, with all that goes on in the life of nature and man, with all the manifold aspects of his experience, his acts and his sufferings."

[3]None of the five roots treated in this study occur in connection with Peter's denial and repentance (Mark 14:66-72 and parallels) or in the account of his later meeting with Christ on the shores of the Sea of Galilee (John 21:15-19). This seems strange since elements so essential to the existence of shame such as exposure and confrontation (cf. especially Luke 22:61 and John 21) are prominent. For other examples of implied shame see especially the prodigal son in Luke 15:17 and the publican at Luke 18:13.

[4]There are but two exceptions: The embarrassed host of Luke 11:5-9 whose obligation to bestow hospitality outweighs the impropriety of

to Christ and His cause. In the one case the absence of shame is reprehensible and a vice which disrupts the relationships established by society; in the other it is a praiseworthy mark of a faithful Christian.[5]

The Social Nature of Shame

In agreement with the eastern view shame in biblical literature is social in nature.

This is stated, first of all, to forestall the possible opinion that shame enjoys independent theological significance. The role which shame may assume as a theological concept is dependent upon and derived from the nature and function of shame in a given culture or society. This fact is best illustrated by a concrete example--the prominence accorded shame in Old Testament eschatology. Three facets of Hebrew life and history combined to make shame a useful concept for conveying the eschatological message of the Old Testament prophets. One is an aversion to the display of the human body and the feelings experienced when one is purposely or inadvertently uncovered; another is the emotion felt by a person exposed to public ridicule or mockery by an opponent; the third is the national humiliation and disgrace experienced by Israel at the hands of her enemies. The feelings of shame associated with these situations was perceived by the prophets as an appropriate reference

---

imposing upon a friend, and the unscrupulous judge of Luke 18:1-8 who frankly renounces any concern for the demands of religion or the conventions of society.

[5]The pertinent passages are treated in the section of Chapter IV entitled, "The Absence of Shame in the Face of Persecution," supra, pp. 65-67.

point for conveying the message of God's judgment upon sinful man. But--and this is the point we wish to make--the idea of shame is not essential to Old Testament eschatology. The message of God's judgment could be, and was in fact, conveyed also by the use of other concepts and ideas. Because of the prevalence of shame in the social setting of Israel, however, the prophets were able to employ it as a suitable vehicle for conveying their theological message.

The social nature of shame is remarked, secondly, in opposition to the view which sees shame primarily as a psychological phenomenon. Although shame has something in common with remorse and embarrassment, it must at the same time be distinguished from both. Feelings of remorse and guilt follow inner reflection and recognition that wrong has been done; shame results when unconventional behavior or the violation of social expectations is exposed, irrespective of the correctness of that behavior.[6] Embarrassment, on the other hand, is but a perplexity or hesitation arising from bashfulness or timidity,[7] while shame is a fear of being unprotected and unaccepted which threatens something "perceived as more valuable than life itself, namely the ego, the self."[8]

---

[6]Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Ethics (New York: Macmillan Company, 1955), p. 20, says that "shame and remorse are generally mistaken for one another. Man feels remorse when he has been at fault; and he feels shame because he lacks something. Shame is more original than remorse. The peculiar fact that we lower our eyes when a stranger's eye meets our gaze is not a sign of remorse for a fault, but a sign of that shame which, when it knows that it is seen, is reminded of something that it lacks, namely, the lost wholeness of life, its own nakedness."

[7]Cf. The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary On Historical Principles (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933), I, 597.

[8]Bulatao, XII, 428. Also worthy of observation is the fact that the outward indications of embarrassment and shame differ. As K. E. Løgstrup says in his article, "Scham," Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart[2]

In attempting to formulate a theory of shame Father Bulatao appeals to the concept of the unindividuated ego.[9] The child in the womb, he says, is but little to be differentiated from the mother. Although he is physically individuated at birth from all the rest of creation he nonetheless remains psychologically embedded in the larger whole of the group to which he belongs. As he once depended upon his mother for security and nourishment, he is now dependent upon and finds his security within the group to which he is bound. Individuals, of course, as well as cultures differ, and

> There is a continum, running, from "embeddedness" on one end to "individuation" on the other end. On the one extreme, the individual will bury his individual self within the group, will totally accept its norms, will follow its traditions, and even when he is a leader will look on himself as patriarch, containing the group within himself, as much bound by the group's traditions as the group itself, and in fact more so since he has to enforce their tradition. On the other extreme is the individual, who by his reflection into and awareness of his own relations with his group has objectified such relationships. Unlike the moth that is stimulus-bound to the source of light, the individual person is aware of the pull upon him and of his power to resist or to give way.[10]

A shame-society is one in which the ego of the individual remains to a large extent unindividuated, in which the traditions accepted by the group tend to enforce conformity to the standards of the group, and in which a person's behavior is for the most part regulated by shame rather than guilt or anxiety.

(Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1932), V, 118, "The embarrassed person doesn't know where to put his hands or how to place his feet; the ashamed person blushes."

[9]Bulatao, XII, 430-37.

[10]Ibid., XII, 431.

There are definite parallels between the concept of the unindividuated ego and the Hebrew "collective" idea. The latter, which Thorlief Boman calls one of the basic characteristics of Semitic languages, is described as follows:

> The concepts of the Israelites are not abstractions drawn from concrete individual things or individual appearances, but they are real totalities which include within them the individual things. The universal concept rules the Israelite's thinking. When, for example, he thinks of a Moabite, he is not thinking of an individual person who has among other qualities that of stemming from Moab . . . The characteristic Moabite qualities trained up a peculiar type, the sum of the Moabite traits. The type is called mo'ab, and the individual Moabite, mo'abhi, is the embodiment of it. . . . The particular individual is only a manifestation of the regnant type.[11]

H. Wheeler Robinson uses the expression "corporate personality" to describe the same kind of thinking. The individual, on the one hand, is identified with the group to which he belongs; the group, on the other hand, is interpreted and seen as a single personality.[12]

Although preserved in the Greek language, the New Testament expresses for the most part spiritual insights which grew on Asian soil and were influenced by Semitic patterns of thought. The Hebrew concepts of personality and society--providing the framework within which the New Testament concept of shame is operative--were carried over into the early

---

[11]Thorlief Boman, Hebrew Thought Compared With Greek (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960), p. 70.

[12]On this point see especially the following essays of H. Wheeler Robinson: "Hebrew Psychology" The People and the Book, edited by A. S. Peake (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925), pp. 353-82; "The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality" and "The Group and the Individual in Israel," both contained in Corporate Personality in Ancient Israel (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964).

Christian community. The determining factor for the specific emphases of shame in the New Testament is therefore the emergence of the new Christian community.[13]

This community is separate and distinct from both the Jewish and pagan communities, although springing from the one and residing within the other. When the principles and beliefs of the Christian community are not in conflict with the Jewish and/or pagan communities, the situations in which shame occurs will coincide.[14] When, however, the basic fundamentals and principles of Christianity are at variance with the surrounding cultures, it is precisely at that point where a difference in the shame concept will also be detected. The most striking example is the response of Christians to persecution in general and their attitude to the cross in particular. Loyalty to their master and the desire to be like Him moved them to accept cheerfully and willingly (compare especially Acts 5:41 and 1 Peter 4:16) what was otherwise considered disgraceful and shameful.

The Basic Ideas Underlying Shame

The three factors essential to the occurrence or existence of shame have already been mentioned in Chapter II,[15] but deserve to be repeated

---

[13]Cf. the section of Chapter III entitled "The Emergence of a New Community," supra, pp. 44-53.

[14]As, for example, the saying of Jesus in Luke 14:9. For similar statements from the Rabbinical literature, see T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus (London: SCM Press, 1949), p. 278. The significance of the statement on the lips of Jesus is to be found not in the saying itself, but rather in the higher interpretation He provides.

[15]Supra, p. 24.

here. One is the person who experiences the emotion of shame; another is that which causes or provokes the feeling of shame in someone; the third is that in whose presence shame is felt.[16] In any particular passage one or more of these elements may be especially emphasized, but never to the complete exclusion of the others.

Within this framework two basic motifs may be isolated, one or both of which are always present when shame occurs. These are the related themes of exposure and non-fulfillment which are so essential to the awakening and existence of shame.

1. Shame is awakened when a person is exposed or uncovered either literally or figuratively.[17] That shame is involved in what Dietrich Bonhoeffer calls "The dialectic of concealment and exposure"[18] is evidenced in biblical literature by the frequency with which its appearance or removal is accompanied by the verbs ana--, kata--, and apo--kalyptō.[19] The sense of shame, then, consists "in the consciousness of failure and exposure before other persons in connection with a point of honour or of strong self-esteem."[20]

---

[16]The frequent, if not usual, absence of this third factor in the western view of shame is what distinguishes it most sharply from New Testament usage.

[17]A Dictionary of the Bible, Dealing with Its Language, Literature and Contents (New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1902), IV, 473.

[18]Bonhoeffer, p. 23.

[19]Cf. Albrecht Oepke, "Kalypto, kalymma, anakalyptō, katakalyptō, apokalypsis," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel and translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1965), III, 556-92.

[20]Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, edited by James Hastings (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1958), XI, 446.

Nietsche's remark that every mind "requires a mask"[21] is especially applicable to the unindividuated ego. Such a person needs the acceptance and the approval of his social group, and thus seeks security in the familiar. He tends to flee unfamiliar situations and avoid encounters where his shortcomings or inferiority may come to light. Even the more sophisticated individuals in a shame-culture are required to put on a front behind which they can hide. A great deal of energy, says Bulatao,

> is directed to preserving one's mask. In the adult, the mask takes the place of the chair behind which the child used to hide, or of the hands that one used to cover one's face. It is the source of security, the defense against anxiety, the claim to one's acceptance by society. When the mask is pierced and the unindividuated ego is exposed for what it is, disaster has struck. The person has been napahiya (put to shame).[22]

In this connection it should also be noted that it is not the deficiency, lack, sin, or shortcoming in itself which awakens shame, but the exposure thereof in the presence of others.

> It will be seen that hiya is not felt except in a face-to-face encounter. A person peeping through a key hole at someone else would not feel hiya in this act unless he was discovered in the act by someone else. A girl eating candy in class would not feel hiya until the bag of candies fell to the floor and her action was exposed before others. One does not feel hiya by oneself, apart from others.[23]

A number of corresponding examples from biblical literature may be cited. The ambassadors of David to King Hanun are permitted to remain in Jericho until their beards are regrown (2 Sam. 10:5) so that they will not have

---

[21]Quoted by Bonhoeffer, p. 21.

[22]Bulatao, XII, 434.

[23]James J. Johnson, "Some Religious Implications of the Hiya Concept" (unpublished manuscript presented to the Mindanao District Pastoral Conference, April 1966), p. 7.

to appear before their countrymen in their shameful condition. The social climber of Luke 14:7-11 feels no remorse over his ungodly ambition and pride, but does experience shame when he is forced to take the lowest seat in the presence of his fellow-guests. The unscrupulous steward of Luke 16:1-9 likewise feels no guilt over swindling his master nor in implicating his master's debtors in the same sin, but does feel prospective shame over the idea of appearing in public as a beggar.

2. The non-fulfillment which results in shame is of two kinds: a non-fulfillment of destiny relating to one's origin, and a non-fulfillment of responsibility in relation to one's group.

Destiny. Commenting on the fall of Adam and Eve, Bonhoeffer says that "Shame is man's ineffaceable recollection of his estrangement from the origin. . . . Man is ashamed because he has lost something essential to his original character to himself as a whole."[24] Nakedness itself does not cause shame, for that is an evidence of the innocence in which man was created. Rather, the recognition that an inexplicable split in human nature has occured disrupts one's fellowship with the creating God, and also destroys the innocence which was intended to characterize man's relation with his fellowman.[25]

This emphasis is carried over to the New Testament examples treated in the first part of Chapter IV. Sterility is shameful because it is a demonstration of woman's inability to perform her appointed destiny of

---

[24]Bonhoeffer, p. 20.

[25]That this relationship is also broken by sin is evident in the fact that fig-leaf aprons were sewed together before God appeared in the Garden (Gen. 3:7-11).

childbearing (compare Gen. 1:28).[26] Begging and poverty are shameful because they conflict with the dognity bestowed by the creating God upon him who was created in the image of God. A workman who needs not to be ashamed (compare 2 Tim. 2:15) is one who fulfills his destiny as a craftsman and the quality of whose work befits the dignity of his calling. The human body is sown in dishonour, atimia (1 Cor. 15:43), not because the body is shameful in itself, for the New Testament admits no Platonic dualism; rather the earthly body is shameful because in its sinful condition it has failed to achieve the glory for which it was intended.

Responsibility. Shame is an emotion experienced by one "who is conscious of acting contrary to, or below, the standards which he approves and by which he knows others judge him."[27] As such it is the acknowledgment, albeit reluctant,[28] of his dependence upon others and the authority which society exercises over him.

---

[26]In addition to Elizabeth's quotation (Luke 1:25) of Rachel's statement in Gen. 30:23, cf. the frequent use of oneidos-oneidismos in Tobit in connection with Sarah's inability to produce offspring.

[27]Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, XI, 446.

[28]Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Creation and Temptation (London: SCM Press, 1966), p. 79, commenting on Gen. 3:7, provides a theological interpretation of man's need to cover himself and what is thereby revealed: "The greatest contradiction here is that man, who has come to be without a limit, is bound to point to his limit without intending to do so. He covers himself because he feels shame. In shame man acknowledges his limit. It is the peculiar dialectic of the torn world that man lives in it without a limit, therefore as the One. Yet he always lives hating the limit and he therefore lives as one divided. The dialectic is that he is ashamed as one naked. Man's shame is his reluctant acknowledgment of revelation, of the limit, of the other person, of God."

The existence and prevalence of shame is closely related to the amount of authority exercised by a given society. In a more permissive culture greater emphasis is placed upon the individual and his freedom; shame consequently plays a minor role in regulating behavior. In an authoritarian-oriented society, however, the important thing is the group and conformity to its standards and traditions; in such a society shame plays an important role in determining and controlling behavior.

The third factor in the basic orientation of shame--namely that in whose presence shame is or is not felt--is usually either the group to which one belongs, its standards or its representatives. Bulatao observes that shame seems necessarily to involve a relationship with another whose opinion is important.

> This other member of the relationship is perceived as an authority figure, whose approval, like that of a parent, is supportive and lends a feeling of worth. His disapproval, like a father's or a mother's frown, arouses anxieties about one's self-worth. Often an audience or the community at large can take over such an authority figure's characteristics, inflating or deflating one's evaluation of oneself.
>
> Hiya (shame) has much to do with a need to conform with the expectation of an authority figure or with society, which is a surrogate of the authority figure.[29]

In the New Testament this emphasis upon the authority or the community and its representatives comes out most clearly in the Pauline writings.[30] The congregation at Thessalonica is to induce shame in disobedient members by temporarily avoiding them. In his own dealings with the Corinthian congregation Paul prefers a personal approach which does not cause shame

---

[29]Bulatao, XII, 426.

[30]Cf. especially the section of Chapter V entitled "Shame as a Motivation for Proper Conduct," supra, pp. 79-81.

(1 Cor. 4:14), but when the situation warrants, Paul is not reluctant to invoke his shame-producing authority (1 Cor. 6:5 and 15:34). The further use of shame in connection with the collection for the saints is dealt with below.

Two Illustrative Examples

The two examples which conclude our study--Paul's use of the shame-concept in connection with the collection for the saints and the occurrence of anaideia in the Septuagint--have been chosen for different reasons. The first has been selected because it illustrates in such a classic manner many of the New Testament emphases of shame. The second was selected to demonstrate that the outward evidences of shame seem to be identical or at least similar in all societies.

The Collection

When St. Paul wrote his first epistle to the Corinthian congregation he set down principles intended to regulate the collection for the saints and made provision for its ingathering (16:1-4). The apostle was particularly concerned that this collection, mentioned also at Rom. 15:26-27 and Acts 24:17, should be a success at Corinth.[31] Paul therefore devotes two entire chapters of a later epistle (2 Corinthians 8-9) to this same subject, urging and encouraging the Corinthians to bring to a generous and speedy conclusion the collection which they had begun. In making his

---

[31]On this point see especially Alfred Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1915), pp. 229-31.

appeal he mentions the liberality of the Macedonians who in spite of their poverty have joyfully given beyond their means (8:1-7). He further sets forth the example of the Lord Jesus Christ who became poor that we, through His poverty, might be rich (8:8-9). Finally, he exhorts them to be ready on schedule so that neither he nor they will be ashamed of their performance.

In order to appreciate the tactfulness with which Paul approaches the subject it is necessary to quote the entire section 9:1-4:

> Now it is superfluous for me to write to you about the offering for the saints, for I know your readiness, of which I boast about you to the people of Macedonia, saying that Achaia has been ready since last year; and your zeal has stirred up most of them. But I am sending the brethren so that you may be ready, as I said you would be; lest if some Macedonians come with me and find that you are not ready, we be humiliated (kataischynthōmen hēmeis)--to say nothing of you--for being so confident.

Certain already-mentioned elements of the shame-concept are here strikingly present. Especially prominent, for example, are (1) the basic orientation of shame involving three factors, (2) what we have called the non-fulfillment of responsibility theme, and (3) the exposure motif.

The persons who will experience shame are Paul[32] and the Corinthians.[33] That which causes shame, in this case a condition or state of being rather

---

[32]The hēmeis in 9:4 may be interpreted in various ways: (1) As including the Macedonians together with Paul. This is unlikely since the Macedonians, who had "overflowed in a wealth of liberality (8:2)," would not share in the shame resulting from the poor performance of the Corinthians. (2) That the pronoun includes the Corinthians along with Paul; the fact however that hēmeis is strongly contrasted with hymeis in the same verse seems to rule this out. (3) The most plausible solution is that Paul is merely employing an editorial "we," although possibly including Titus and the other brother who may be associated in his boasting about Corinth.

[33]The tact which Paul employs is remarked by Plummer, p. 255: "He puts his own shame first; but of course the disgrace would be theirs

than another person, is the unpreparedness of the Christians at Corinth. Those in whose presence shame will be felt are the Macedonians who may accompany Paul on his visit to Achaia; the shame of the Corinthians will be heightened by the presence of Paul, an authority figure within the Christian community.

The non-fulfillment of responsibility revolves around the word aparaskeuastous, "unprepared." The collection was to be a visible expression of the unity of the Christian community, and was designed to strengthen the ties which bound Gentile and Jewish Christians together. Apparently the arrangements in Corinth

> had almost come to a standstill by the time he wrote, and the sum of his vigorous, affectionate, and graceful words of counsel to the church is to revive the zeal which had been allowed to cool amid their party quarrels.[34]

If the congregation is prepared when Paul arrives, thus fulfilling their responsibilities, there will be no shame; if however they are unprepared, shame will result.

The point at which shame will actually occur is the moment when the unpreparedness of the Corinthians is exposed to the view of Paul and the Macedonians. Shame is experienced only in a face-to-face encounter with another person. The Corinthians may have done nothing since the writing of Paul's first appeal, and they may in fact do nothing at all,[35] but

---

rather than his. He asks them to spare him, which is a better plea than appealing to their own interests, which are just touched parenthetically."

[34]Adolf Harnack, The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961), p. 183.

[35]Acts 24:17, however, seems to imply the contrary.

they will not feel shame until their deficiency is exposed to others. Likewise the boasting of Paul in the readiness and generosity of the Corinthians may be unfounded, but Paul will not experience shame until his misplaced trust actually comes to light.

Anaideia in the Septuagint

Throughout this study it has frequently been asserted that the presence or absence of shame on the part of an individual is determined by the society of which he is a member and the culture to which he belongs. The presence or absence of shame, however--regardless of culture, and whatever the particular cause may be--always appears to exhibit itself in the same way. A look at the occurrence of anaideia in the Septuagint will demonstrate this fact.[36]

Anaideia, it will be recalled, is the alpha-privative form of aidōs, the word which denoted for ancient Greeks the sense of honorable inhering in the virtuous man. Anaideia, then, betokens an insensitivity to the concerns of others and reveals an impudent and insolent attitude. Limited as a noun to one occurrence each in the New Testament and the Septuagint,[37] it appears adjectivally or adverbally a total of fourteen times in the latter. Almost invariably the pertinent passages disclose the area of the person which evidences shamelessness, either by an adjective's modifying the noun or by the placing of the noun in the dative case.

---

[36]The occurrence of anaideia in the Septuagint has been chosen to illustrate the manifestations of shame for two reasons. First of all, while the evidences of shame are implied in a number of New Testament passages, they are never given overt expression. Secondly, the manner in which shame reveals itself is frequently seen most clearly where, contrary to expectation, shame is not experienced.

[37]Luke 11:8 and Sirach 25:22 respectively.

Twice the noun psychē is modified by the adjective "shameless," indicating that the persons in question reveal the general characteristics of anaideia. Sirach 23:6 is a prayer not to be delivered into the hands of such persons, and Is. 56:11 compares the shameless leaders of Israel to greedy, insatiable dogs.

Six times anaideia occurs in connection with prosōpon, face. Typical examples are Deut. 28:50 and Prov. 7:13.[38] In the former it is stated that God will punish disobedience on the part of Israel by sending against them an ethnos anaides prosōpō (a nation of stern countenance, RSV), who will neither respect the old nor have mercy on the young. The latter expounds the method employed by a harlot in her seductions. Her shamelessness is obvious both in her apparel (7:10) and in her manner (7:11). She accosts a young man in public, kisses him, and with an impudent face, anaidei de prosōpō, lures him to her home with promises of pleasure and assurances that her husband is out of town.

The presence or absence of shame then reveals itself primarily in the face; three of the remaining passages also locate the manifestation of shame in parts of the face, namely the eyes and the mouth. Blushing is the most common expression of shame, but accompanying signs may be the lowering or covering of the head and the averting of the gaze.[39] The

---

[38]The other four are Prov. 21:29 and 25:23, Eccl. 8:1 and Dan. 8:23.

[39]Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, XI, 446. Bulatao, XII, 427, distinguishes between an "escape" tendency and a "freeze" tendency as expressions of shame. The escape tendency, more prominent in children, is seen in such acts as burying one's face in the knees of his mother or sliding down in one's desk. The freeze tendency, more prominent among adults, may exhibit itself in two ways: Rushing into an "Elvis Presley routine" to draw attention from the actual cause of shame, or putting on the appearance of ritualized pleasantness.

shameless person, on the other hand--as exemplified by the ruthless conqueror and the impudent harlot in the passages treated--refuses to display those evidences of shame which a socially-conscious individual would. In referring to the Tagalog[40] walang hiya (which corresponds very closely to the Greek anaideia) Robert Fox makes an interesting comment:

> In Tagalog, a person with "no shame" is spoken of as talaban ng mukha (the person's face can be cut) or kapalkapal ng mukha (the person's face is thick). In both expressions, there is the implication of "insensitiveness," for to be without hiya (shame) is to be unaware of the basic mechanism which underlies interpersonal relationships, that is, to be "asocial," "vulgar," and "uncouth," as well as "insensitive." It is interesting to note that the Tagalog speak of a "thick face," and "insensitive face," rather than of a "thick skin" as among Americans, for it is in the "face" that the feelings of hiya (shame) are shown.[41]

1 Kings (1 Samuel) 3:29 and Sirach 26:11 locate the evidences of shamelessness more specifically in the eye(s). Eli is reproved by the Lord through a man of God for looking at His sacrifices "with greedy eye (RSV)," anaidei ophthalmō, taking for himself and his sons the choicest parts. Sirach warns a father to keep close watch over a headstrong daughter and to guard against her impudent eye lest she sin by harlotry.

Sirach 40:30, however, associates shamelessness with the mouth of the importunate beggar.[42] "In the mouth of the shameless," says the author, "begging is sweet, but in his stomach a fire is kindled." Three

---

[40]Tagalog, perhaps the most widely spoken of more than eighty Filipino dialects, serves as the basis for what hopefully will become one national language.

[41]Robert B. Fox, "The Filipino Concept of Self-Esteem," Social Foundations of Community Development, edited by Socorro C. Espiritu and Chester L. Hunt (Manila: R. M. Garcia Publishing House, 1964), p. 359.

[42]One is reminded of the strident tones in Maurice Ravel's orchestration of Moussorgsky's Pictures At An Exhibition, where the beggar Schmuyle attempts to wheedle a handout from the lordly Samuel Goldenburg.

other passages at least infer a connection between anaideia and speaking:[43] The Lord, speaking in Jer. 8:4-9, points out as evidences of His people's perpetual backsliding (apostrophēn anaidē) both their refusal to pray as they ought and also their claims to wisdom; Theodotion's revision of the Septuagint at Dan. 2:15, characterizes as anaidēs the command of Nebuchadnezzar that all the wise men of Babylon should be put to death; and Baruch 4:15, in a description of the destroyers of Jerusalem, seems to equate shamelessness with speaking a strange or foreign language.

While immodest or importunate speech is a manifestation of shamelessness, the shame-motivated person is more likely to relapse into silence in an attempt to divert attention from himself.

---

[43]A connection previously observed in Chapter II, supra, p. 20.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alston, Leonard. Stoic and Christian in the Second Century: A Comparison of the Ethical Teaching of Marcus Aurelius With That of Contemporary and Antecedent Christianity. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1906.

The Apocrypha: Revised Standard Version of the Old Testament. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1957.

The Apocryphal New Testament. Translated by Montague Rhodes James. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924.

The Apostolic Fathers. With an English translation by Kirsopp Lake. 2 vols. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1959.

Aristotle. The Nicomachean Ethics. English translation by H. Rackham. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1926.

Arndt, William F., and F. Wilbur Gingrich. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Augustine, Saint. The City of God. New York: Random House, Inc., 1950.

Barnett, Milton L. "Hiya, Shame and Guilt: A Preliminary Consideration of the Concepts as Analytical Tools for Philippine Social Science," Philippine Sociological Review, XIV (October 1966), 276-82.

Barrett, C. K., editor. The New Testament Background: Selected Documents. London: SPCK, 1956.

Barth, Karl. The Epistle to the Romans. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.

Beare, Francis Wright. The Earliest Records of Jesus. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

-----. The First Epistle of Peter: The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958.

Benedict, Ruth. Patterns of Culture. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1934.

-----. The Chrysanthemum and the Sword. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1946.

Biblia Hebraica. Edited by Rudolph Kittel. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Wurttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1937.

The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society. G. Ernest Wright and an Ecumenical Committee in Chicago. London: SCM Press, 1954.

Blaiklock, E. M. Cities of the New Testament. London: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1965.

Blass, F., and A. Debrunner. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Blauw, Johannes. The Missionary Nature of the Church: A Survey of the Biblical Theology of Mission. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962.

Boman, Thorleif. Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960.

Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. The Communion of Saints: A Dogmatic Inquiry into the Sociology of the Church. New York: Harper & Row, 1960.

-----. Creation and Temptation. London: SCM Press, 1966.

-----. Ethics. New York: Macmillan Company, 1955.

Bornkamm, Gunther. Jesus of Nazareth. London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., 1960.

Bright, John. A History of Israel. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959.

-----. The Kingdom of God. New York: Abingdon Press, 1953.

Bruce, F. F. The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary. London: Tyndale Press, 1951.

-----. The Apostolic Defence of the Gospel: Christian Apologetic in the New Testament. London: Staples Printers Limited, 1959.

-----. The Books and the Parchments: Some Chapters on the Transmission of the Bible. Westwood, N. J.: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1963.

-----. Israel and the Nations: From the Exodus to the Fall of the Second Temple. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1963.

-----. The New Testament Documents. London: Staples Printers Limited, 1943.

Brunner, Emil. Man in Revolt: A Christian Anthropology. London: Lutterworth Press, 1939.

Bulatao, Jaime C. "Hiya," Philippine Studies, XII (July 1964), 424-38.

-----. "The Hiya System in Filipino Culture," The Philippine Educational Forum, XIV (March 1965).

-----. "The Manileno's Mainsprings," Four Readings on Philippine Values. Edited by Frank Lynch, S.J. Quezon City, Philippines: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1964. Pp. 50-86.

Bultmann, Rudolf. Existence and Faith. London: Collins Press, 1960.

-----. The History of the Synoptic Tradition. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.

-----. Jesus and the Word. London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934.

-----. Primitive Christianity in Its Contemporary Setting. London: Collins Press, 1956.

-----. Theology of the New Testament. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955.

Burtness, James H., and John P. Kildahl, editors. The New Community in Christ: Essays on the Corporate Life. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1963.

Buttrick, George A. The Parables of Jesus. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1928.

Calderon, Aurelio B. "An Analysis of Steinberg's Use of Walang Hiya to Explain Filipino Elite Collaboration in World War II," Philippine Sociological Review, XV (July-October 1967), 141-50.

Charles, R. H. Eschatology: The Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, Judaism and Christianity. New York: Schocken Books, 1963.

-----, editor. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.

Cochrane, Charles Norris. Christianity and Classical Culture. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957.

Cole, William Graham. Sex in Christianity and Psychoanalysis. New York: Oxford University Press, 1955.

Conner, Walter Thomas. The Epistles of John. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1957.

Conzelmann, Hans. The Theology of St. Luke. London: Faber and Faber, 1960.

Cremer, Hermann. Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1954.

Cullmann, Oscar. The Christology of the New Testament. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959.

-----. The Early Church. London: SCM Press, 1956.

Dibelius, Martin. From Tradition to Gospel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, n.d.

-----. Jesus. London: SCM Press, 1963.

A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. Edited by James Hastings. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, Vol. I, 1906; Vol. II, 1908.

Dictionary of the Apostolic Church. Edited by James Hastings. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, Vol. I, 1915; Vol. II, 1918.

A Dictionary of the Bible, Dealing with Its Language, Literature and Contents. Vol. IV. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902.

Dodd, C. H. According to the Scriptures: The Sub-structure of New Testament Theology. London: James Nisbet and Company Limited, 1952.

-----. The Authority of the Bible. London: Collins Press, 1960.

Driver, S. R. An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament. New York: Meridian Books, 1956.

Edersheim, Alfred. The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956.

Eichrodt, Walther. Man in the Old Testament. London: SCM Press, 1951.

Elliott, John Hall. The Elect and the Holy: An Exegetical Examination of 1 Peter 2:4-10 and the Phrase Basileion Hierateuma. Leiden, Holland: E. J. Brill, 1966.

Ellis, Peter F. The Men and the Message of the Old Testament. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1963.

Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. Vol. XI. Edited by James Hastings. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1958.

The Expositor's Greek Testament. Edited by W. Robertson Nicole. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951.

Feucht, Oscar E., editor. Sex and the Church: A Sociological, Historical and Theological Investigation of Sex Attitudes. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1961.

Filson, Floyd V. A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew. New York: Harper & Row, 1960.

-----. The New Testament Against Its Environment: The Gospel of Christ the Risen Lord. London: SCM Press, 1950.

Freeman, Kathleen. God, Man, and State: Greek Concepts. London: MacDonald & Co. Ltd., 1952.

Frend, W. H. C. Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church: A Study of a Conflict from the Maccabees to Donatus. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.

Goldschmidt, Walter, editor. Exploring the Ways of Mankind. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962.

Gomperz, Theodor. Greek Thinkers: A History of Ancient Philosophy. Vol. IV. London: John Murray, 1912.

Goodspeed, Edgar J. Index Patristicus Sive Clavis Patrum Apostolicorum Operum. Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1907.

Grant, Frederick C. The Gospels: Their Origin and Their Growth. London: Faber and Faber, 1957.

Grosheide, Frederik Willem. Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953.

Guthrie, George M. The Filipino Child and Philippine Society. Manila, Philippines: Philippine Normal School Press, 1961.

Harnack, Adolph. History of Dogma. 7 vols. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1961.

-----. The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962.

Harrisville, Roy A. The Concept of Newness in the New Testament. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Augsburg Publishing House, 1960.

Hartmann, Nicolai. Ethik. Berlin: Walter de Grusster and Co., 1926.

Hatch, Edwin. The Influence of Greek Ideas on Christianity. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.

Hering, Jean. The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians. London: Epworth Press, 1962.

Hollnsteiner, Mary R. "Reciprocity in the Lowland Philippines," Four Readings on Philippine Values. Edited by Frank Lynch. Quezon City, Philippines: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1964. Pp. 22-49.

Hoskyns, Sir Edwyn, and Noel Davey. The Riddle of the New Testament. London: Faber and Faber, 1958.

The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Edited by Samuel Rolles Driver, Alfred Plummer, and Charles Augustus Briggs. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, various dates.

The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. Vol. IV. Chicago: Howard-Severance Co., 1915.

The Interpreter's Bible: The Holy Scriptures in the King James and Revised Standard Versions with General Articles and Introduction, Exegesis, Exposition for Each Book of the Bible. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, various dates.

The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. IV. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Jacob, Edmond. Theology of the Old Testament. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958.

Jaeger, Werner. Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture. 3 vols. New York: Oxford University Press, 1939.

James, William. The Varieties of Religious Experience. New York: Collier Books, 1961.

Jeremias, Joachim. The Central Message of the New Testament. London: SCM Press, 1965.

Jocano, F. Landa. "Rethinking 'Smooth Interpersonal Relations,'" Philippine Sociological Review, XIV (October 1966), 282-91.

Johnson, James J. "Some Religious Implications of the Hiya Concept." Unpublished manuscript dated April 1966, presented to the Mindanao District Pastoral Conference.

Johnson, Sherman E. Jesus in His Own Times. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1958.

Josephus: Complete Works. Translated by William Whiston. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1964.

Käsemann, Ernst. Essays on New Testament Themes. London: SCM Press, 1964.

Kee, Howard Clark, and Franklin W. Young. Understanding the New Testament. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1957.

Kelly, J. N. D. Early Christian Doctrines. New York: Harper & Row, 1958.

Kittel, Gerhard and Gerhard Friedrich, editors. Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. Vol. I, 1964; Vol. II, 1964; Vol. III, 1965; Vol. IV, 1967.

Kittel, Gerhard and Gerhard Friedrich, editors. Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1954, Vol. V.

Kluckhohn, Clyde. Anthropology and the Classics. Providence, Rhode Island: Brown University Press, 1961.

Kraeling, Emil G. Rand McNally Bible Atlas. New York: Rand McNally & Company, 1956.

Leenhardt, Franz J. The Epistle to the Romans. London: Lutterworth Press, 1957.

Lightfoot, J. B. The Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1962.

-----. Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1957.

-----. Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1953.

Lynch, Frank. "Social Acceptance," Four Readings on Philippine Values. Edited by Frank Lynch. Quezon City, Philippines: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1964. Pp. 1-21.

Lynd, Helen Merrell. On Shame and the Search for Identity. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1958.

Manson, T. W. A Companion to the Bible. 2nd edition edited by H. H. Rowley. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963.

-----. On Paul and John: Some Selected Theological Themes. London: SCM Press, 1963.

-----. The Sayings of Jesus. London: SCM Press, 1949.

-----. The Servant-Messiah: A Study of the Public Ministry of Jesus. Cambridge: University Press, 1961.

-----. The Teachings of Jesus: Studies of its Form and Content. Cambridge: University Press, 1963.

Martin-Achard, Robert. From Death to Life: A Study of the Development of the Doctrine of the Resurrection in the Old Testament. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1960.

Mayor, Joseph B. The Epistle of St. James: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, Comments and Further Studies in the Epistle of St. James. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1954.

Mednick, Melvin. Encampment of the Lake: The Social Organization of a Moslem-Philippine (Moro) People. University of Chicago: Philippine Studies Program, 1965.

Metzger, Bruce M. An Introduction to the Apocrypha. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957.

Moore, George Foot. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, The Age of the Tannaim. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Vol. I, 1927; Vol. II, 1927; Vol. III, 1930.

Morales, Rosalina A. "Ugaling Pilipino: An Introduction to Filipino Thought and Action." Unpublished paper.

Moule, C. F. D. The Birth of the New Testament. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1962.

-----. Christ's Messengers: Studies in the Acts of the Apostles (Part I) London: Lutterworth Press, 1957.

-----. An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek. Cambridge: University Press, 1960.

Moulton, James Hope, and George Milligan. The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1949.

Muilenburg, James. The Way of Israel: Biblical Faith and Ethics. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1961.

Neill, Stephen. The Interpretation of the New Testament: 1861-1961. London: Oxford University Press, 1966.

The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Edited by Ned B. Stonehouse. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, various dates.

Nickle, Keith F. The Collection: A Study in Paul's Strategy. London: SCM Press, 1966.

Novum Testamentum Graece. Edited by Eberhard Nestle and Kurt Aland. Stuttgart: Wurttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1964.

Oesterley, W. O. E., and Theodore H. Robinson. An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament. Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1958.

Otto, Rudolf. The Idea of the Holy. New York: Oxford University Press, 1958.

-----. The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man: A Study in the History of Religion. Boston: Starr King Press, 1957.

Pearson, Lionel. Popular Ethics in Ancient Greece. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1962.

Pedersen, Johannes. Israel: Its Life and Culture. Translated by Mrs. Aslaug Moller. 2 vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1926-1947.

Piers, Gerhart, and Milton B. Singer. Shame and Guilt. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1953.

Rad, Gerhard von. Genesis. London: SCM Press, 1961.

Ramsay, Wm. M. The Church in the Roman Empire Before A.D. 170. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1954.

-----. The Cities of St. Paul. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1960.

-----. A Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1965.

-----. The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia and Their Place in the Plan of the Apocalypse. London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., 1909.

-----. St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1954.

Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, Die. Second edition. 5 vols. and index. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1927-1932.

Richardson, Allan, editor. A Theological Word Book of the Bible. New York: Macmillan Company, 1960.

-----. An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1958.

Rienecker, Fritz. Sprachlicher Schlüssel zum Griechischen Neuen Testament. Giessen: Brunnen-Verlag, 1963.

Riesman, David. The Lonely Crowd: A Study of the Changing American Character. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950.

Robertson, Archibald Thomas. Word Pictures in the New Testament. 6 vols. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1930-1933.

Robinson, H. Wheeler. Corporate Personality in Ancient Israel. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1955.

-----. The Cross in the Old Testament. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1955.

-----. "Hebrew Psychology," The People and the Book. Edited by A. S. Peake. London: Oxford University Press, 1925. Pp. 353-82.

Robinson, James M. The Problem of History in Mark. London: SCM Press, 1957.

Robinson, John A. T. The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology. London: SCM Press, 1952.

Rogers, A. K. Morals in Review. New York: Macmillan Company, 1927.

Rowley, H. H. The Faith of Israel: Aspects of Old Testament Thought. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956.

-----. The Unity of the Bible. Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1957.

Saber, Mamitua, and Mauyog Tamano, with Charles K. Warriner. "The Maratabat of the Maranaw," Philippine Sociological Review, VIII (January-April 1960), 10-15.

Schlatter, Adolf. The Church in the New Testament Period. London: SPCK, 1961.

Schmoller, Alfred. Handkonkordanz zum Griechischen Neuen Testament. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Wurttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1951.

Schurer, Emil. A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus. New York: Schocken Books, 1961.

Schwartz, Eduard. Ethik der Griechen. Stuttgart: K. F. Koehler Verlag, 1951.

Schweitzer, Albert. The Quest of the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study of its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede. New York: Macmillan Company, 1964.

Schweizer, Eduard. Lordship and Discipleship. London: SCM Press, 1960.

Scott, Ernest F. Man and Society in the New Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947.

Scott, R. B. Y. The Relevance of the Prophets. New York: Macmillan Company, 1953.

Selwyn, Edward Gordon. The First Epistle of St. Peter: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Essays. London: Macmillan & Company, Ltd., 1961.

Septuaginta. Edited by Alfred Rahlfs. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Wurttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935.

Shedd, Russell Philip. Man in Community: A Study of St. Paul's Application of Old Testament and Early Jewish Conceptions of Human Solidarity. London: Epworth Press, 1958.

Social Foundations of Community Development: Readings on the Philippines. Edited by Socorro C. Espiritu and Chester L. Hunt. Manila, Philippines: R. M. Garcia Publishing House, 1964.

Sociology in the Philippine Setting. By Chester L. Hunt, et al. Manila, Philippines: Alemar's, 1954.

Stoeckhardt, G. Commentary on St. Paul's Letter to the Ephesians. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1952.

Streeter, Burnett Hillman. The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins. London: Macmillan & Company Ltd., 1961.

Swete, Henry Barclay. The Gospel According to St. Mark: The Greek Text with Introduction Notes and Indices. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956.

Tasker, R. V. G. The Old Testament in the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1946.

Taylor, Vincent. The Gospel According to St. Mark. London: Macmillan & Company, Ltd., 1955.

-----. The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching. London: Macmillan & Company, Ltd., 1959.

Thompson, J. A. The Bible and Archeology. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1962.

Trench, Richard C. Notes on the Miracles of Our Lord. Westwood, N. J.: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1953.

-----. Notes on the Parables of Our Lord. Westwood, N. J.: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1953.

-----. Synonyms of the New Testament. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co. Ltd., 1915.

Tristan, H. B. Eastern Customs in Bible Lands. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1894.

The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. R. V. G. Tasker, General Editor. London: Tyndale Press, various dates.

Vine, W. E. Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words. Vol. IV. London: Oliphants Ltd., 1944.

Understanding the Philippines and America: A Study of Cultural Themes. Edited by Frank Lynch and Mary Hollnsteiner. Manila, Philippines: Ateneo de Manila, 1965.

Weiser, Arthur. The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development. New York: Association Press, 1961.

Westcott, Brooke Foss. The Epistle to the Hebrews. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, n.d.

Westermann, Claus. Essays on Old Testament Interpretation. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1950.

Wikenhauser, Alfred. New Testament Introduction. New York: Herder and Herder, 1963.

Wild, John. Plato's Theory of Man: An Introduction to the Realistic Philosophy of Culture. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1946.

Wilder, Amos N. Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1939.

Winer, George Benedict. A Grammar of the New Testament Diction: Intended as an Introduction to the Critical Study of the Greek New Testament. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Company, 1859.

Wehlstrom, Eric H. The New Life in Christ. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1950.

Wright, G. Ernest. Biblical Archaeology. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1957.

Wuest, Kenneth S. First Peter in the Greek New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1952.